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Jane Roland Martin demonstrated how women are educated into the male cognitive perspective. To be female and educated means the alienation from the feminine. This thesis looks at the underlying forces that allow the existence and perpetuation of feminine alienation.

An understanding of the nature of group membership is essential in comprehending domination and oppression. The relationship between domination and oppression maintains what Isis Marion Young labels “cultural imperialism”. The norms of the dominant group (of which the masculine has membership) then are the norms of society and thus feminine alienation results.

The Ethic of Care seeks a way to overcome what Young labels cultural imperialism and Martin entitles the male cognitive perspective. Nel Noddings’ theory of care serves as the benchmark. Noddings’ theory falls short and Martin’s Schoolhome moves further towards an answer to oppression and feminine alienation. However, a clear-cut solution is found
in the future development of Martin's theory and the acceptance of Young's group relation theory.
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Chapter One: Introduction

...[B]ut here I was actually at the door which leads into the library itself. I must have opened it, for instantly there issued, like a guardian angel barring the way with a flutter of black gown instead of white wings, a deprecating, silvery, kindly gentleman, who regretted in a low voice as he waved me back that ladies are only admitted to the library if accompanied by a Fellow of the College or furnished with a letter of introduction... Never will I wake those echoes, never will I ask for that hospitality again, I vowed as I descended the steps in anger.... [A]s I passed the chapel door.... I had no wish to enter had I the right, and this time the verger might have stopped me, demanding perhaps my baptismal certificate, or a letter of introduction from the Dean. But the outside of these magnificent buildings is often as beautiful as the inside.

Virginia Woolf, 1929

Once upon a time, in a land very close by—an inner-city school in Toronto—there was a 6-year-old boy who was now sporting a juvenile turban. It was placed anew on his head each day before he ventured into the world, and more precisely into his grade one classroom. Wisps of long hair escaped from their cloth binding, large brown eyes with beautiful thick eyelashes sought new experiences and knowledge, and creamy skin completed the picture of this very striking child. The children in his class did not see the beautiful child the teacher saw. They saw a boy who looked, in their eyes, like a girl. This, they instinctively knew, was their point of immediate entry into the nasty world of denigration. Yells punctuated the playground din. Whispers hung in the class. “Sunny is a girl!” “Sunny is a girl!” Their

---

1Virginia Woolf: A Room of One’s Own and Three Guineas. (Toronto: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1993), pp. 3-4. This reference is from A Room of One’s Own, 1929. Many feminist writers refer to Virginia Woolf. She is a benchmark for ideas and their development. When I first started in Philosophy of Education, I thought I had found a gem all my own but as I read I realized I was not alone in taking inspiration from and being influenced by the writings of Virginia Woolf. I see and feel her outrage and humiliation as she stood on the steps of that library.
world view told them that calling a boy a girl was the worst thing they could possibly say to a boy. The boy’s mother ventured inside the walls of the classroom to protect her child from this ultimate denigration and humiliation. The teacher must put an end to this. Her son cannot be called a girl. The teacher answered, trumpeting the mother’s call for the teasing to stop, as such teasing was unkind, uncaring, and hurtful. This was not the collegial, anti-racist, accepting atmosphere that she was striving for. Something was amiss. “Yes,” the mother replied, calming down. “How dare they call my son a girl.” The teacher turned to the mother, her son clinging to her side, “There is nothing wrong, bad or insulting about being female. I will speak to the children about being mean and hurting a classmate’s feelings, but I will not take the stand that being called a girl as such is a great insult.” The mother’s eyes filled with tears as frustration, hatred and love for her child streamed down her face. She turned away and walked down the hall to the office where she would seek justice for her son.2

In “A Professorship and an Office of One’s Own,” Jane Roland Martin reflects on a thesis candidate who wanted to pursue a study on Virginia Woolf. The candidate’s male professor dissuaded the young scholar. Martin wonders how often this happens on the subject of women. No study of women, no body of work by women, no recognition of Virginia Woolf as a philosopher—the connection is made. Martin wonders about the possibility of changing the lens we view scholastic work through and making possible the inclusion of Woolf in the Philosophy of Education pantheon. It is a matter of values:

Wondering if I should break the news to him that on the self-same day Woolf had been very much on my mind, as I started to say that although I did not know a great deal about it, as a woman philosopher of education I thought it possible that

---

2 This is a recreation of an event that I experienced while I was teaching Grade 1 in the inner city of Toronto in 1996.
Woolf might have had some interesting ideas on women's education. I need not have worried about my wording. Quite forgetting his audience, this nice man continued his recital of female misdemeanors. “Another woman told me that she wanted to write a thesis on Jane Addams,” he said in a tone of what almost sounded like sorrow. “And what did you say to her?” “What anyone would have said: that if she were a candidate of history of education this would of course be an applicable topic but that for a philosopher of education it was out of the question. You are not going to believe this,” he went on warming on his subject, “but an older student of mine wanted to follow women school teachers around to see how they conceptualize teaching. Naturally, I pointed out to her that participant observation is not a method of philosophical inquiry. And there was the one who wanted to analyze the concept of coeducation. What did I say to her? I told her the truth: there was not enough to say on this topic to sustain a thesis.”

Why have I opened my thesis with the above quotations and the vignette? They embody the problem (for me), and record the nature and existence of the place that women hold now and held in societies through time and cultures. I am not an anthropologist or a sociologist so I cannot and will not detail the many positions and layers of feminine myth and reality. I do however live, study and work in North American society and by virtue of that I am qualified to comment on Western North American society.

Virginia Woolf writing on being excluded from the public world of

---


4 I say “North American” because the materials of study that I have selected are mainly American. I have experienced the Canadian take on Western society and read the American view. So as is generally with things Canadian, I end up with the North American point of view.
education because she was a woman, my tale of the 6-year-old, Sikh boy, and Jane Roland Martin's musings about the status of women in her discipline of philosophy of education, stem from the same sense of neglect and denigration that women, femininity and all things associated with the female gender "enjoy". Different cultures and religious affiliations maintain oppression of the feminine to a greater or lesser degree. The attack on things female is very much alive and well in "enlightened" North American society and can be found in the bank, the office tower, the newspaper, the television broadcast, the school around the corner from home, and most probably in the home as well. It is this subordination of the feminine that sets the stage for this body of writing and study.

R. S. Peters, the noted philosopher of education, wrote: "'[b]eing educated' equates to the concept of 'being transformed'."\(^5\) "Education implies that a man's outlook is being transformed by what he knows."\(^6\) Peters would argue that his view of education holds an inherent good and that all who partake of education will benefit from the transformation gained by learning and maintaining a close proximity to the educational good. In other words, education is a virtue and, to many, a blessing.

On the eve of the millennium I find myself on the phone, on the internet, in my community and in the schools, fighting to maintain

education: its ideals, fairness, funding and personnel. I am fighting for the virtue, the goodness, of education. I want education to transform the students I teach. I want their lives to be enriched, their communities enhanced, their futures positive and fulfilling. I hold that education is a good that has the inherent ability to aid my students in their search for the majesty of a greater existence. It sounds corny put in that way but that is the emotion and intellectual position I carry within myself and act upon.

However, I am haunted by current movements in education today that are taking away what universality and inclusionary nature it may have had. I am also haunted by the strong possibility that the transformation that I want from my version of educational good is flawed at its core and is transforming students in such a way that they are a cause of, and major stakeholders in, their own oppression. Advances have been made in the position of women relative to men in our society, but the fact remains, as demonstrated by Martin's and my anecdotes, that the subordination and oppression of women and the feminine are still an everyday occurrence. I use the term "feminine" because the oppression is of all things feminine and that takes us beyond that of women themselves to their works, values and histories and that which is feminine in men.

Jane Roland Martin argues, in her groundbreaking paper "The Ideal of the Educated Person," that the educational ideal put forth by R. S. Peters is deficient, the source of a harmful bias that alienates women from their feminine nature.
Martin states that:

... [O]ur culture associates the traits and dispositions of Peters' educated person with males. To apply it to females is to impose on them a masculine mold. I realize that as a matter of fact some females fit our masculine stereotype and that some males do not, but this does not affect the point at issue, which is that Peters has set forth an ideal for education which embodies just those traits and dispositions our culture attributes to the male sex and excludes the traits our culture attributes to the female sex.7

Thus, while it is possible for a woman to possess the traits of Peters' educated person, she will do so at her peril: her possession of them will cause her to be viewed as unfeminine, i.e., as an unnatural or abnormal woman.8

Martin reviews the ways in which women have been systematically left out of the public/productive side of society. Women and the perspective have been excluded as the subject matter of most disciplines, while the male cognitive perspective, at the heart of all education and interaction, has reinforced itself. All elements that refer to the feminine have been excluded and/or disparaged under the norms posed by the male cognitive perspective as the feminine is not valued. Any of the works and histories about women included in the male world are posed from the male point of view. It is the male interpretation of what women are, how women act and what women are saying. Women are thus alienated from their feminine viewpoint when they are educated by and into the public world by an exclusively male perspective.

8 Ibid., p. 103.
Maureen Ford outlines the difference between Peters and Martin in terms of educational relevance:

... [T]he point being made is that the disagreement between Peters and Martin boils down to the question of what is educationally relevant. In direct contrast to Peters, Martin asserts that feelings, etc., are educationally relevant, and implies that the reason they are relevant is their role in motivating action.9

I use Ford to illustrate that Martin has taken a wholly different path from Peters. The feminine is of educational relevance to Martin; feelings count in her view of the educational transformation that occurs for an individual or group of individuals. Martin was breaking new ground in her disclosure of the alienation of the feminine; the expectation that the domestic should be included in the educative function; and the double bind that women face when choosing to become educated outside the home—alienation and education, or femininity and domestic education only.

Taking Martin's objections to Peters at face value leaves educators in a tenuous position—are they educating to the harm and detriment of the students? What happens to the inherent goodness of education? Are we being betrayed by our own ideals and virtues? Unfortunately the answer is yes. Yes, that is, if the content and viewpoints of the educational ideal stay within the narrow band that liberal education has occupied for so long. Martin is asking that the content of education be expanded to include feminine values, arts, history—the feminine point of view. She wants to end

the cultural imperialism and marginalization, to use Iris Marion Young's terms, of the masculine over the feminine.

Young understands cultural imperialism to involve "the universalization of a dominant group's experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm."\(^{10}\) As the masculine mode of thinking, acting and communicating becomes the norm for both women and men, marginalization of women also occurs, for the stories, histories, interpretations and values of women are not being used and/or valued.\(^{11}\) Cultural imperialism and marginalization are forms of group oppression that silence and often render impotent large segments of society.

Martin wants this oppression to end. She wants the "double bind" that women find themselves facing when entering the world of education to be eradicated.

How to end the oppression of women or, perhaps better stated, the feminine, is the issue I will pursue in this thesis. (I make a distinction between the feminine and women because the oppression of the feminine affects men as well as women, and therefore, is a larger issue than the physical presence of women.) The task being presented is to find the true virtue of education for the first time by raising the issues of and seeking a solution to the alienation of the feminine and the oppression that that

---


entails. I will endeavour to make the case that Iris Marion Young makes a strong argument around the nature of group oppression and the types of oppression—cultural imperialism (in particular) and marginalization—hampering the virtue of education. Using Young’s idea that oppression is a social group phenomenon, and not an individualistic one, I will explore the feminist theories of “care,” notably the works of Nel Noddings and the later writing of Jane Roland Martin. Noddings provides us with a detailed look at the inner workings and limitations of care. Martin’s *Schoolhome* fosters the concepts of care and allows for the integration of Young’s group theories of oppression.

Nel Noddings argues the case for care. I will explore Noddings’ arguments to see if her ethic of care is an answer to the deficient nature of education as exposed by Martin. Noddings puts forth care as the tonic for what ails education. The practice of caring, she argues, would transform schools and society, producing “competent, caring, loving, and lovable people.”¹² Noddings suggests that “caring is the bedrock of all successful education and that contemporary schooling can be revitalized in its light.”¹³ Care, for Noddings, would reorganize the curriculum to include the needs of all students and the global needs of the world. By its relational nature, care would help end the violence and injustices that education has propagated against various sectors of society, including the feminine.

¹³Ibid., p. 27.
I shall later argue that Noddings' philosophical stance of care would have great difficulty overthrowing or eradicating the alienation noted by Jane Roland Martin because care, as outlined by Noddings, does not overtly carry the concept of the group nature of oppression within its construct. Noddings' relational mode of caring is dyadic—only affecting two individuals at a time—and as such does not address the larger social group nature of oppression set forth by Iris Marion Young. It is Young's concept of group oppression that will go a long way in helping us in our quest to purge education of the cultural imperialism and marginalization that creates Martin's alienation of the feminine. So it is for me to detail the workings of Young's forms of oppression and the group nature of oppression, combining her ideas with Martin's alienation of the feminine, the theory of care in general, Noddings' ideal of care and its relational substance, and finally, looking back again at Martin to seek a path to a solution to the problem of oppression in education.
Chapter Two: The Alienation Problem

Jane Roland Martin's claim that the feminine is denied status in the structure of liberal education as taught and perpetuated in Western society, causing alienation of the self for women (and I would argue men as well), is the foundation and background for this thesis. This alienation has come to be known as the "double bind." The double bind is Martin's way of labeling the position that liberally educated woman are put into by virtue of being educated. Since the feminine is not given value in, or even recognized by, the male cognitive perspective, women educated and defined by this perspective become alienated from their feminine nature. The only other choice available to women is to stay in the domestic realm because at the moment the masculine construct of education and society is dominant and the norm. In her thesis on Jane Roland Martin's criticism of the established theory of the educated person, particularly that of R. S. Peters' "educated man," Maureen Ford defines Martin's "double bind."

For women, the harm is of a different sort. Peters' model represents a choice between a rock and a hard place, a 'double bind,' as Martin calls it. Women may opt to forego an education or they may opt to pursue an education very likely to be alienating, for which they have little chance of being rewarded, given 'genderized' evaluation of that achievement.\(^4\)

\(^4\) Ford, p. 69.
Jane Roland Martin takes a strong stance against the mainstream ideas put forth by leading philosophers of education and traditional liberal education in general because of their masculine bias. R. S. Peters and his "twin" Paul Hirst are the mainstays of philosophy of education that Martin butts her alienation theory against. Peters' "educated man" — or more appropriately, "educated person" — is Martin's alienated woman cut off from her feminine side. Martin notes that Paul Hirst's forms of knowledge, which are the bases for liberal education and the contents and values therein, establish the norm in society. She can accept Peters' use of the phrase "educated man," as Martin feels Peters used it in a gender-neutral way. However, Martin does take issue with the types of knowledge used to define the Peters-Hirst liberally "educated man."

Does not the fact that the forms of knowledge theory ignore education for feeling, emotion, and effective participation in the world simply mean that it is incomplete? ... However, when a theory functions as the forms of knowledge theory does, namely, as a theory of that education deemed valuable, it surely must be held responsible for ignoring the development of such central aspects of human existence as action, feeling, and emotion.

Martin brings into focus the genderization of the traits, skills, values and curriculum that are embodied in liberal education, attributing them to the male cognitive perspective. This perspective holds a dominant position

---

16 This norm can be linked with the group oppression theory of Iris Marion Young and be labeled cultural imperialism. I will forge the link in Chapter Three.
in society and is the norm. The values within the masculine outlook are considered the 'natural' way of things. All people are encompassed by the masculine perspective and alternative views are ignored, invalidated, subordinated and/or excluded. It is a masculine construct and image that is presented to the world through education, art, love, politics, economics and religion. Women are encompassed by the masculine image of the world, which means that the essence of women, their work and their stories are coloured by and/or constructed by the masculine. Women are excluded from the masculine world, denied the right to be feminine and viewed through a male image in society; therefore the claim can be made that knowledge is not gender-neutral, and in so being does serious harm to women, requiring a major divorce from their feminine nature in order to acquire the trappings of the liberally educated person, and/or mind. (The alienation of the feminine is also detrimental to men, because their feminine side must also be obliterated from common practice.) Because educated women are immersed in an educational process that "embodies just those traits and dispositions our culture attributes to the male sex and excludes the traits our culture attributes to the female sex,"¹⁸ women are educated at their "peril" and in being educated take on the status of unfeminine, unnatural or abnormal. ¹⁹

Martin points out that the Peters-Hirst liberal education paradigm excludes more than just the feminine perspective:


¹⁹ Ibid., p. 103.
What is perhaps less apparent, but equally important, is that it also excludes from a liberal education the development of artistic performance, the acquisition of language skills including the learning of a second language, and education for effective moral action as opposed simply to moral judgment.20

Martin argues that it is necessary to base her criticism on the Peters-Hirst ideal because they are authorities in the discipline of philosophy of education; it is their ideas that run throughout a large body of work in philosophy of education. Not only must Peters' educated person process knowledge, but he/she must have a body of knowledge and a conceptual scheme that takes knowledge from disjointed facts to understand principles, the "reason why" of things.21 An educated person's pursuits can be practical as well as theoretical as long as they're done for their own sake and involve standards to which one must be sensitive.22 And therefore, one gains "depth, breadth, and knowledge of good."23 In Peters' words, "[b]eing educated' equates to the concept of 'being transformed.'"24 "Education implies that a man's outlook is being transformed by what he knows."25 If the forms of awareness, knowledge, truth, and/or "the self-realization of the individual"26 are flawed with an inherent male bias, the self-realization will be one with a male perspective.

21 Martin, "The Ideal of the Educated Person," p. 98.
22 Ibid., p.98
23 Ibid., p. 98.
25 Ibid., p. 19.
26 Ibid., p. 20.
Mathematics, science, literature, history, human sciences, fine arts and philosophy all contribute to the educated person. These disciplines directly relate to Paul Hirst's forms of knowledge and are the building blocks of liberal education. Hirst asserts that:

[t]he definition is clear, because education is determined objectively in range, in structure, and in content by the forms of knowledge itself and their harmonious, hierarchical interrelations.\(^{27}\)

These forms and their "hierarchical interrelationships" are found in the public world and have logic, reason and objectivity at their core. For much of history women were not part of the public sphere, nor were they given the right and ability to exercise logic, reason or objectivity.

For Jane Roland Martin, all that makes up the "educated man" and his liberal education "incorporate[s] a male cognitive perspective, and hence a sense of the extent to which Hirst's liberally educated person and its twin — Peters' educated person — looks at things through male eyes."\(^{28}\)

In sum, the intellectual disciplines into which a person must be initiated to become an educated person exclude women and their works, construct the female to the male image of her and deny the true feminine qualities she does possess.\(^{29}\)

It is the male perspective found in the very core of her chosen


\(^{29}\) Ibid., p. 101.
disapline (and liberal education in general) that concerns Martin. The points
Martin makes about the study of Virginia Woolf in “A Professorship and an
Office of One’s Own” reflect on the state of male bias found in the discipline
of the Philosophy of Education. Martin argues that the past and present
systems of education ignore a large realm in their curricula: that which
addresses the feminine. Right from the start women and/or men with
highly-developed feminine sides are beset with inherent difficulties when
engaging in the process of education. Martin uses the discipline of History
and the words of Richard Hofstaedter to demonstrate her point:

'Memory is the thread of personal identity, history is public
identity.' History has identified itself as the record of public and
political aspects of the past; in other words, as the record of the
productive processes — man's sphere — of society. Small
wonder that women are scarcely mentioned in historical
narratives! Small wonder that they have been neither the objects
nor the subjects of historical inquiry until very recently! The
reproductive processes of society which have traditionally been
carried on by women are excluded by definition from the
purview of the discipline.

The recent book Biting the Dust, The Joys of Housework details the
positions women held (and many still hold) in the private world of
homekeepers:

Yet paradoxically, cleaning house is also a way in which women
can assert their moral, familial and domestic world. Keeping a
place clean is a way of declaring one's superior values and
standards, a way of setting oneself and one's surroundings apart
from the chaos and dirt of the outside world; a way of showing

off self-esteem. 'I feel so good about myself when the house is clean,' one woman said. 'I feel the house is a better place for me and my family, and the credit for that is all mine, and everyone knows it.' For this woman, doing battle with dirt is an act of conscious virtue, and achieving that virtuous glow far outweighs any negative notions about cleaning as a lowly occupation.32

'I think my mother became so house proud because there was nothing else she could control or achieve,' says Jane. 'She didn't have a job, she didn't finish school, she didn't have much confidence. For years and years she just kept house for my dad and my sisters and me. She wanted my dad to come home to a perfect house, and as kids we kept messing it up. She worked all the time to control the mess and dirt—and us.33

The work assigned to the female world is not of value in terms of historical record or event history. The private world did not and still does not carry nearly the same weight as the public realm of men and their affairs. One can see why being enclosed in this feminine world would be marginalizing and could cause, in Kathryn Morgan's words, "moral madness."34

Martin introduces her productive/reproductive concepts that correspond with the public/private split, and are the foundation of her attack on the conventional educational ideals concerning gender and education. The "productive" is the outcome of the male cognitive perspective and involves the political, the economic, the social and the cultural spheres. In short every aspect of human interaction outside the home. The reproductive realm is the home and takes in the birth, raising, maintenance and emotional

33 Ibid., p. 36.
nurturing of the young. Although necessary for the survival and success of individuals in the productive realm, the skills and knowledge that are imparted in the home are not perceived to be of enough value to be recorded or taught in traditional educative circles. Liberal education for Martin is narrow and intolerant; it only teaches knowledge and skills from the productive side of life, forming a person who has:

knowledge about others, but will not be taught to care about their welfare, let alone to act kindly toward them. That person will be given some understanding of society, but will not be taught to feel its injustices or even to be concerned over its fate.\(^{35}\)

...[A] liberally educated person will be a lopsided person; a thinker but not a doer, an experiencer but not a maker, a feeler but not a moral agent. And consequently a world populated by liberally educated people had better be perfect to begin with for the individuals in it will not act to make it better; even if it occurs to them to do so, they will not know how.\(^{36}\)

Examples abound of where we sublimate our reproductive side in favour of our productive side. For example, the journalist who, in recording and reporting the bombing of a building or the slaughter of ethnic minorities or the plight of children in a war ravaged country, does not "interfere" with the events upon which he or she is reporting. This would compromise heralded journalistic integrity, something that is valued by our society. Intellectually and morally the journalist may be revolted by the inhumanity occurring, but no action is to be taken. There are valid arguments, political and practical, for the position of passive observer; however, the role of the journalist is, not coincidentally, molded to the same type of theory-vs.-action

\(^{35}\) Martin, "Needed: A New Paradigm For Liberal Education," p. 44.
\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 53.
split that the educational theory behind liberal education offers. There is a mind/body split in education and society that Martin feels must be healed before we can include all people in the educational process without alienation and to facilitate social justice. Education has a societal function for Martin and she criticizes R. S. Peters for not recognizing this function and its consequences in his educational theory:

Peters would deny even more vehemently that he assigns to education a societal function. Yet an examination of his conception of the educated person reveals that the end product of the education he envisions is designed to fit into a specific place in the social order; that he assigns to education the function of developing the traits and qualities and to some extent the skills of those whose role it is to use and produce ideas.37

If education has a social function, which I believe it does, and the social function is redesigned to include the "three C's" of care, concern and connection, as Martin would have it, then our journalist may be able to balance objective reporting with humanitarian aid.

The reproductive, or private, processes are not included in many educational and training models of the past or present. These processes include much of what was traditionally found in the woman's sphere and do not carry with them the same values, assumptions or morality as the masculine norm. The Ontario Curriculum Grade 1-8 — Language and Mathematics 1997 is a good example of the emphasis in curriculum direction and value. The "basics" are stressed—reading, writing, and mathematics—

along with a toehold in Information Technology. Achievement and excellence are measured by testing against the criteria gauged "normal" by the educational establishment—the same educational criteria that Martin equates with feminine alienation. If the reproductive processes were included in The Ontario Curriculum or liberal education in general, there would be a curriculum booklet on childbirth and child rearing; family and household management; interpersonal relationships; supportive, nurturant and empathetic qualities; and the innate quality of intuition. Put another way, the curriculum would include what Martin defines as the three C's: caring, concern, and connection. It does not. Noble as these qualities are, they do not matter in our society where the objective, analytic, and rational thought is the cornerstone of our present educational system. Following Martin, I have invoked a distinction between the productive and reproductive processes of society and I have argued that Peters and Hirst define education in terms of the productive processes only. It is also true that the productive processes are the driving force behind today's education. Martin feels strongly that the reproductive processes, the feminine, must attain greater value for our world to survive and flourish:

[The fate of the earth depends on all of us possessing these qualities. Thus, although these qualities are associated in our minds with the reproductive processes of society, they have the broadest moral, social, and political significance. Care, concern, connectedness, nurturance are as important for carrying on society's economic, political, and social processes as its]
reproductive ones. If education is to help us acquire them, it must be redefined.38

Jane Roland Martin asserts that educational thought and practice is imbued with a male bias so pervasive that to remove it would irrevocably weaken the structural integrity of our present educational system. She proposes that the qualities inherent to the feminine side of society be injected into the educational system's foundations, thereby enhancing the integrity of the system as a whole. "Becoming educated can be a journey of integration, not alienation."39 Martin is of the opinion that the enforced split between the productive and reproductive—masculine and feminine—sides is a fundamental flaw of our educational system and our society.

This 'tragic flaw' may be the downfall of our educational system and our society because it perpetuates a constant state of alienation for 50 percent of the population and does not allow the other 50 percent to use the feminine sides of their personalities to educate, seek truths, or solve injustices in society.

Because no attempt is made to foster other-directed feelings and emotions, such as caring about the welfare of others and a sense of injustice, or to develop other-directed skills, their social links will at best be weak and their social sensitivity will be nonexistent.40

The Peters-Hirst educated person is an ivory tower person; a person who can reason, yet has no desire to solve problems in the real world; a person who understands science but does not

38 Ibid., p. 77.
39 Ibid., p. 83.
worry about the uses to which it is put; a person who can teach flawless moral conclusions but feels no care or concern for others. 41

Addressing the male bias held in liberal education will allow for a new vision of liberal education and social justice. The trick is to combine the feminine perspective with the masculine. The educational system needs both perspectives to thrive. Removing the masculine would be tantamount to educational and social suicide and leave us with an equally unbalanced system. The question that poses itself here is, what theory or system could redress this imbalance? The chapters to follow will explore the place of care as a long-term solution.

If I am sounding repetitive, it is because of the enormity of the claim being made by Jane Roland Martin and myself, and the sheer number of people affected by the aims, norms and theories prevalent in education and in the larger society. At least half the population is being manipulated or ‘transformed’ by the educational system into the position of taking other’s history for their own, subjecting themselves to self-alienation, oppression and marginalization.

The seriousness of the devaluation and alienation of the feminine can be demonstrated by turning to the scholarship and wit of Kathryn Morgan who brings home the essence of Martin’s feminine alienation in her discussion of “Women and Moral Madness.” Morgan explores the ways in which patriarchal ideology and lived experience can twist and destroy a

woman's moral voice and her sense of moral integrity. Much like Martin's unnatural, unfeminine, abnormally educated woman, Morgan issues forth with "a moral woman is a woman in whose head a voice is repeating words like 'immature,' 'pathological,' 'inadequate,' 'immoral,' 'evil.'" For Morgan, Martin's 'double bind' and moral metamorphoses is but one of four situations present that imperil women's moral sanity. Morgan cites Lawrence Kohlberg's inability to assign women the capacity of full moral agency; she notes the distinction between public and private morality, pointing out that women are consigned to private morality while public morality is the morality that 'counts'; and she delves into the perceived invisibility of moral domains in the lives of women—a perspective that contributes to women not being recognized as moral beings.

ultimately, this experience can lead to a genuine sense of confusion and a kind of moral madness which is then cited, in a patriarchal culture, to further discredit a woman's moral subjectivity.

Kathryn Morgan traces women's lack of moral functioning back to philosophers like Aristotle and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Women were assigned a 'different morality;' one which kept them from competing in, and with, the world of men.

A woman's passivity, her weakness, her submissiveness, and her resultant reliance on guileful manipulation are taken by

---

42 Morgan, p. 201.
40 Ibid., p. 201.
44 The quotations from Biting the Dust illustrate what Kathryn Morgan is saying here.
46 Ibid., pp. 202-203.
Rousseau to be marks of her moral virtue lived out by a woman who is obedient, loyal, and sentimental. Rousseau assigns women a different morality because, like many thinkers, he does not regard women capable of theoretical reasoning. At the same time, he claims that such rationality is a necessary precondition for a self-directed moral life.47

Morgan points out that even the present day Canadian Criminal Code holds that women have ‘different’ morality, in her reference to “episodic moral epiphenomenalism.”

The more interesting theories are those that support episodic moral epiphenomenalism by claiming that there are various normally occurring processes that occur in women’s bodies which lead to a kind of moral derangement, that for given episodes of our lives we are necessarily crazy in some respect or other because of how our healthy womanly bodies operate. In many cultures, women who are menstruating are expected to be in some deranged and dangerous physical state. Women who are pregnant are expected to behave in peculiar sorts of ways and express bizarre preferences. In the Canadian Criminal Code women who have just given birth are expected to go into a period of insanity, especially if they breast-feed their infants. Consequently, murder of a newborn infant by the mother is not treated like other kinds of murder even though it may occur several months after the birth. Menopause is assumed to be a stated of derangement which goes on for years.48

47 Ibid., p.206. Jean-Jacques Rousseau placed women in a subordinate position to men and did not subscribe to the educating of women in the same fashion as men. Women were to be confined to the home and the service of men. Jane Roland Martin points out that Rousseau, for all his male chauvinism, was one of the only thinkers in educational philosophy to recognize that the reproductive side of life was a necessity and that the productive realm would not function without being balanced by the reproductive, as illustrated in the following quote:

In the union of the sexes each alike contributes to the common end, but in different ways. From this diversity springs the first difference which may be observed between man and woman in their moral relations. The man should be power and the will; it is enough that the other should offer little resistance.

When this principle is admitted, it follows that woman is specially made for man’s delight.... Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile* (London: Everyman, 1993), p. 385.

48 Ibid., p. 208.
My foray into Kathryn Morgan is meant to illustrate the severity of women's position. Morgan challenges the models and norms that our society takes as just, normal and worthy of perpetuation. The essence of what Morgan is challenging dovetails with Jane Roland Martin's feminine alienation in liberal education. Morgan is also heading in the direction of Iris Marion Young's theories of oppression and its group nature. Morgan's "moral madness" gives us a different perspective and a linguistic variation for the same oppressive forces that Martin has pin-pointed.

As a substantive rational moral theory, feminist ethics challenges the model of the moral subject as an autonomous, detached, rational subject, often seeing this hyper-masculinist ideal of the moral self as both psychologically and morally flawed. We can expect new models of the self, perhaps pluralistic in nature, to emerge.49

Conclusion

Jane Roland Martin does not see the educational systems of traditional liberal schooling as having addressed the issue of gender in any sort of substantive, structural way. A hidden agenda of male bias, and therefore political, economic and social power, is at work in today's educational curriculum. This tendency applies to both the academic and the vocational streams in education. R. S. Peters and Paul Hirst do not challenge the social order. They set up educational theory and conditions that give little value or

49 Ibid., p. 224.
recognition to the attributes that Martin assigns to the female gender. The reproductive side is not in partnership with the productive side, and this causes the alienation of women, who must turn their backs on their feminine traits of nurturance, intuition, sensitivity, and caring to avail themselves of a liberal education. Once they have successfully achieved a liberal education, women are then ridiculed for possessing male traits of rationality, objectivity and aggressiveness. Women are, according the Martin, in a double bind, compromised at every turn. The division of and disregard for the reproductive side of life does harm to men as well, for they are not given the chance to value, obtain or practice the necessary feminine components of human existence in this society. A balance of the productive and reproductive sides in education would revolutionize both education and society. For the first time the library, closed to the likes of Virginia Woolf, would be open for both genders, equally. A new gender-combined, gender-just perspective can then begin its developmental journey through the knowledge content, the institutions, and minds and bodies of female and male students alike.

The ideas embedded in the traditional philosophies of liberal education are the main ingredients for educational policy and practice that are used to teach both male and female students in our educational system.\(^5\) This

---

\(^5\) The new Ontario Curriculum that came out in 1997 puts emphasis on the three “R’s.” Subjects are to be taught in a segregated manner with skill acquisition as a major focus. This may not be Peters and Hirst ideal for they, I think, would press for much more critical thinking, but it surely does not embody the likes of emotions and other feminine arts.
philosophy is narrow in its definition of what the value in education is, and contains a systemic masculine bias. Jane Roland Martin makes gender the focal point for the alienation of the feminine that occurs in the course of being educated. While I agree that the gender issue is at the forefront, I find that I must move ahead to find some answers to the problem of alienation and I am inclined to move in the direction taken by Maureen Ford. Ford puts the problem in terms of dominance and subordination:

The point that... I believe Martin, wish[es] to make is that the gender of the observer is very likely a major determinant in the type of picture conjured up by the notion of the 'educated person.' Contrary to Martin, however, I believe that it is not the location of the observer within the productive or reproductive realms that is crucial. It is, rather, the location of the observer in a position of dominance, namely, in the position of men within a society organized by a gender hierarchy, which is the problem.\footnote{Ford, p. 109. Italics mine.}

Ford's assessment of Martin's alienation of the feminine is in line with the theories of Iris Marion Young. It is Young's definitions of oppression and the systematic and societal nature of the oppression that I believe will guide us to finding an accommodation that will allow a solution to the problem of feminine alienation and devaluation. Virginia Woolf felt that "[d]ifferent we [women] are, as facts have proved, both in sex and in education."\footnote{Woolf, \textit{Three Guineas}, p.229.} Martin would add the word gender here and Morgan, Ford, Young and I would weave in structural oppression (if I may be so bold as to place words in their mouths.) I also feel that Jane Roland Martin would concur with this, as she
takes issue with the devaluation of the attributes held or assigned to women and their non-existence in the core values of our present-day educational system. Hints that Martin is moving from gender theories to the larger structural oppression theories can, I think, be found in her 1992 work *The Schoolhome*. I will explore the connection between Martin and Young in Chapter Three and detail Martin's later writing at the end of the thesis.
Chapter Three: Introducing Iris Marion Young

Iris Marion Young has developed a structural definition of oppression that takes oppression from the realm of liberal individualism to that of social relationships and societal construction. Jane Roland Martin has shown us clearly that the educational system is imbued with masculine values and points of view. The masculine bias is a system bias, a social bias. It is not one man acting upon one woman. The alienation of the feminine—the reproductive processes—that Martin brings to the forefront, is not an individual concept either. Martin's alienation is structural in nature; it carries the 'group' at its core, and therefore, lends itself to the finding of a solution to the bias in the group oppression theory of Young. Barbara Applebaum and Dwight Boyd address this shift from individualism to societal group structures by the use of the phrase "power to" as opposed to the phrase "power over":

The first task concentrates on loosening the tight connection between "dominance" and issues of control, ruling and governing. Successful completion of this task requires a moving away from the focus on tangible and observable behaviours, from the limiting preoccupation with individual dyadic relations, and from the exclusive engrossment with "power over". The second task entails shifting our concentration to another, albeit not as prominent, understanding of "dominance", i.e., what is prevailing and most influential. With this understanding in mind and by directing our attention more to social groups rather than individuals, to categories of meaning rather than tangible behaviours, and to a notion of
“power to” rather than “power over”, we are in a better position to explicate how the more subtle form of dominance works. It is the movement into the “power to”, the redefining of the understanding of “dominance,” that I feel will allow for the evolution of the problem of feminine alienation in our educational system into a balanced, inclusionary educational curriculum free of oppression and bias.

Iris Marion Young states: “In accordance with ordinary political usage, I suggest that oppression is a condition of groups.” Young defines a social group as:

...a collective of persons differentiated from at least one other group by cultural norms, practices, or way of life. Members of a group have a specific affinity with one another because of their similar experience or way of life, which prompts them to associate with one another more than with those not identified with the group, or in a different way. Groups are an expression of social relations; a group exists only in relation to at least one other group.

Applebaum and Boyd are helpful here because they point out the importance and the difference in Young’s treatment of the ‘social group’. For Young the group comes before the individual and the group is what formulates many attributes of the individual. Membership in the social group is not voluntary but is very defining:

In contrast to either an aggregate or an association, Young’s notion of a “social group” does not start from the assumption that the individual is the appropriate unit of focus, as somehow

54 Young, p. 40. (Italics is mine for emphasis.)
55 Ibid., p. 42
prior to the collective, and in terms of which the collective must be understood. Unlike aggregates, social groups are not "merely arbitrary classifications of individuals according to attributes which are external to or accidental to their identities" (Young, 1990, p. 44).  

The key to understanding Young's stance on oppression, and how oppression maintains such a pervasive presence in our society, is her treatment of oppression as a group relation. This group nature of oppression is what gives oppression its long tentacles into society, with a grasp of fierce strength.

In its new usage, oppression designates the disadvantage and injustice some people suffer not because a tyrannical power coerces them, but because of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society. ... But oppression also refers to systematic constraints on groups that are not necessarily the result of the intentions of a tyrant. Oppression in this sense is structural, rather than the result of a few people's choices and policies. Its causes are embedded in unquestioned norms, habits, and symbols, in the assumptions underlying institutional rules and the collective consciousnesses of those rules. ... In this extended structural sense oppression refers to the vast and deep injustices some groups suffer as a consequence of often unconscious assumptions and reactions of well-meaning people in ordinary interactions, media and cultural stereotypes, and structural features of bureaucratic hierarchies and market mechanisms — in short, the normal processes of everyday life. We cannot eliminate this structural oppression by getting rid of the rulers or making some new laws, because oppressions are systematically reproduced in major economic, political, and cultural institutions."

The interplay and interaction of groups of people in society—group with

---

56 Applebaum and Boyd, p. 11.
57 Young, p. 41. (Italics is mine for emphasis.)
group and individuals within a group—foster the necessary elements for the existence of oppression. Traditional interpretations require that tyranny of a ruling group be present before oppression can manifest itself. However, Young breaks with tradition and analyzes and evaluates social groups in conjunction with the cause, power and persistence of oppression. She develops the theory that there is not a ruling group, per se, but rather individuals who act according to a composite of group affiliations, interests, and dominations. For example, I, as a white, female, heterosexual, English-speaking, educated, middle-class person, living in a liberal society, could be said to belong to six privileged (dominant) groups, and one subordinate (oppressed) group. The subordinate group membership I hold is that of being a woman.

It is the interplay of the societal groups I belong to by default (and the associations I belong to by choice) that determine my oppression, and how much that oppression will affect my status in society. Being female has placed me in the subordinated group with the largest number of people in the world. And that fact has determined my course of action and being to a great extent. I am not ‘me’ if I am not female, both in sex and gender. I cannot be the same individual outside the realm of my ‘femaleness’ (my social group), as it determines so much of my identity and how the rest of humanity, both male and female, interacts with me. The male sex and gender holds a position of privilege in relation to the female sex and gender. Young puts forth that an
oppressed group does need "a group that is privileged in relation"\textsuperscript{58} to it for oppression to occur.\textsuperscript{59} Again Applebaum and Boyd provide us with a clarifying statement:

... [O]ne social group cannot be understood without understanding another (the norm against which it is evaluated). Thus, to "be a woman" cannot be understood without considering what it means "to be a man." Similarly, understanding what it means to "be a person of colour" or "to be homosexual" cannot be understood without reference to what it means "to be white" or "to be heterosexual", respectively.\textsuperscript{60}

I exist within the structural confines of my society, a member of the female sex and gender in relation to the male sex and gender group.

It is a given that I am a member of an oppressed group of people, and therefore qualify as being oppressed. Or maybe we need to slow down and reflect upon the argument, taking a page from its own logic. A member of an oppressed group I am, and this being female has had a role in determining my position in society, my thoughts and actions. But the meshing of the numerous and varied groups to which I belong also play their part in my oppression, in my reality. My other group affiliations and/or memberships—race, culture, education, socio-economic level, global location, sexual

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., p. 42.
\textsuperscript{59} Young also argues that "[t]he systematic character of oppression implies that an oppressed group need not have a correlate oppressing group." (Young, 1990, p.41.) This could been seen as a contradiction in her argument. I think that one could view this statement in light of Young's opening up of the definition of dominance to mean social groups interacting and acting upon one another, rather than the traditional view of the tyrant and the oppressed. I take Young to mean that a group does not have to have a one-to-one dominant-subordinate relationship for oppression to occur as the larger systemic nature of societal groups will possess the oppressive forces and propagate them.
\textsuperscript{60} Applebaum and Boyd, p. 13.
orientation—may negate (or moderate) the oppression that occurs by being female. Therefore, I would argue that although I belong to an oppressed group in society I am still situated in a privileged position when all the interplay between groups is tallied up.

The same discussion has also led to the recognition that group differences cut across individual lives in a multiplicity of ways that can entail privilege and oppression for the same person in different respects. Only a plural explication of the concept of oppression can adequately capture these insights.  

Maureen Ford and Katherine Pepper-Smith note this very current at work in their paper on intelligibility:

Yet, at the time of this writing we are cognizant of the extent to which our shifting perspectives do not prevent us from repeating errors of arrogant perception. We are frustrated by the length of time that passed before we remembered to consider how we are situated within our sexual identities by other social relations. We think about the ways that Maureen's "being out" would be a different question were she not sharing with Katherine the subject positions white, Anglo, and educated person. Certainly the "full social situation" includes Maureen's privilege to be safe in ways not accessible to some lesbian women who did not benefit from such privilege. We are reminded, then, that intelligibility, far from being an understanding that can be gained conclusively, is an understanding that must be performed, again and again.  

Applebaum and Boyd give us further elucidation:

Moreover, our resulting identities are in this sense multiple (and not even necessarily coherent or internally consistent), and fluid in that, even for the same person, they can entail being both privileged and subordinated in different respects. Although there is a wide spectrum of such groups, always somewhat in flux for any individual, some are both relatively stable and

---

61 Young, p. 42.
constitute more significant markers of personal identity, and are thus of more central concern in the context of understanding claims of dominance .... The essential point to keep in mind for our concern for unpacking how dominance in the expanded sense operates is that the appropriate unit of focus is not the socially abstracted individual of possible dyadic relation, nor is it the isolated and independent group, but the social group which is differentiated in relation to other social groups and within which individuals are defined.63

There is a definite ebb and flow between dominant and oppressed groups, and it is a confluence of influences that determines how the factors of domination and oppression will interact and react in reality. Ford and Pepper-Smith make the observation, as noted in the above quotation, that intelligibility is fluid, taking on a different context depending upon the position of persons with respect to their current membership in social groupings. The temperature of intelligibility must be taken frequently to ensure understanding. The same can be said of Young's groupings in society and their influences on the oppression experienced by members of an oppressed group. In her critique of liberal individualism, Young takes issue with the tendency to view people as individuals rather than as members of groups. She is strident in her position that group differentiation remains endemic in modern society. The web of social interdependency is increasing in the world.64 This, however, is not necessarily a problem for Young because group differentiation and interdependency are not in themselves

63 Applebaum and Boyd, pp. 13-14.
64 Young, p. 47.
oppressive. "To assert that it is possible to have social group difference without oppression, it is necessary to conceptualize groups in a much more relational and fluid fashion."

Groups and group oppression must be revisited in much the same way that Ford and Pepper-Smith advocate the revisitation of intelligibility to gain conclusive understanding. Ford and Pepper-Smith are working from a real life situations of dominance and subordination in their own lives: Ford is an open, active lesbian, and Pepper-Smith is a married heterosexual mother. It could be said that Ford is oppressed by the societal dominance of heterosexuality. But group relations, like the intelligibility explored in their paper, is more complicated than that. The fluidity of groups and their interaction could place Ford in a position of equality or dominance. For example, one of the communities Ford interacts with and is a member of, the academic community, is known to be generally accepting of alternative choices and lifestyles.

The relational nature and fluidity of groups is multi-layered: membership in some groups is fluid; the members of a particular group do not necessarily hold a single viewpoint; the oppression experienced by a member of a group is dependent upon the aggregation of all the groups that person is a member of; and the oppression of a group is subject to the relative potency of the dominant group or groups:

\footnote{Ibid., p. 47.}

\footnote{Ibid., p. 47.}
Although social processes of affinity and differentiation produce
groups, they do not give groups a substantive essence. There is
no common nature that members of a group share. As aspects of
a process, moreover, groups are fluid; they come into being and
they fade away.\textsuperscript{67}

This view of group differentiation as multiple, cross-cutting,
fluid, and shifting implies another critique of the model of the
autonomous, unified self. In complex, highly differentiated
societies like our own, all persons have multiple group
identifications. The culture, perspective, and relations of
privilege and oppression of these various groups, moreover,
may not cohere. Thus individual persons, as constituted partly
by their group affinities and relations, cannot be unified,
themselves are heterogeneous and not necessarily coherent.\textsuperscript{68}

Young builds a compelling case for the massive influence groups have
on individuals, and allows for the variables and changes that we encounter in
life. Without fluidity, Young’s group theory would succumb to the strain of
rigid bounders that do not reflect human reality. The relational nature of
Young’s social group theory holds within its definition the human element,
that is the social nature of people. It is foolish to think that any substance,
idea, social norm or individual can stand completely alone. Alone, we would
evaporate into the abyss: we would not be able to conjure up the thoughts
and language that sustain our being. Individuals, then, are subject to and a
subject of their social groups. What they think, feel, express and how they
interact is a product of the various groups they belong to and interact with on
a daily basis:

Groups, on the other hand, constitute individuals. A person’s
particular sense of history, affinity, and separateness, even the

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., p. 47.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., p. 48.
person's mode of reasoning, evaluating, and expressing feeling, are constituted partly by her or his group affinities.\textsuperscript{69}

Individuals interact with each other under the influence and experience of their individual group composites. A one-to-one relation is never just the product of one person relating to another. It is the product of group memberships held by the individuals, group relations interacting, and the cycle of group dominance and oppression playing out their respective roles and consequences. We are not alone in the formation of our identities and our social interactions. In this respect solitude is not a quality of being human as much as social group interacting is.

Iris Marion Young hones an understanding of the social nature of human beings and the relational element and actions of groups that affect persons within the societal sphere, creating an ebb and flow of dominance and oppression. Once again Applebaum and Boyd provide us with some clarity, helping to interpret Young's concepts of dominance, power and oppression:

What we have been trying to do so far is to reorient and clarify our focus when we start thinking about how to understand dominance and, in particular, how we ourselves are potentially implicated. What we are now able to see better is that we need to think less in terms of individuals and more in terms of social groups, less in terms of tangible behaviour and more in terms of categories of meaning, less in terms of power as controlling/constraining and more in terms of power as enabling/constraining.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., p. 45.
\textsuperscript{70} Applebaum and Boyd, p. 16.
With our loosened and expanded definition of the group nature of oppression, let us move to another point on the conceptual explanation of Young’s oppression theory: the systemization of oppression. The same ideas of interaction, overlapping interplay and fluidity are present in Young’s systemization. Young categorizes oppression into five “faces”—exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. Her division of oppression allows for the flexibility needed to give voice to the varied and discordant individuals and groups within complex societies.

"Applying these five criteria to the situation of groups makes it possible to compare oppressions without reducing them to a common essence or claiming that one is more fundamental than another."\footnote{Young, p. 64.}

The presence of any of these five conditions is sufficient for calling a group oppressed. But different group oppressions exhibit different combinations of these forms, as do different individuals in the groups. Nearly all, if not all, groups said by contemporary social movements to be oppressed suffer cultural imperialism. The other oppressions they experience vary. Working-class people are exploited and powerless, for example, but if employed and white do not experience marginalization and violence.... As a group women are subject to gender-based exploitation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. Racism in the United States condemns many Blacks and Latinos to marginalization, and puts many more at risk, even though many members of these groups escape that condition; members of these groups often suffer all five forms of oppression.\footnote{\textit{Ibid., p. 64} (italics is mine for emphasis.)}

All five categories of oppression have their part to play in Young’s social explanation of oppression. The two “faces” that play the greatest roles in
explaining the position of women (and hopefully in creating the understanding and foundation for arriving at a solution of sorts for Jane Roland Martin's feminine alienation) are marginalization and cultural imperialism. I believe that cultural imperialism is the more formidable form of oppression in the context of Martin's double bind, but marginalization is both a cause and a by-product of feminine alienation.

Cultural imperialism is the oppressive agent that Jane Roland Martin is raging against (and, as I will detail in Chapter Four, Nel Noddings proposes to fix through her philosophy of care). As quoted in Chapter One, Iris Marion Young states that "[c]ultural imperialism involves the universalization of a dominant group's experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm."73 "To experience cultural imperialism means to experience how the dominant meanings of our society render the particular perspective of one's own group invisible at the same time as they stereotype one's group and mark it out as the Other."74 The dominant groups in our society have a firm hold on communication, information and its interpretation in the society at large, thereby ensuring that their views, experiences, values, goals and achievements are the norm.

Those living under cultural imperialism find themselves defined from the outside, positioned, placed, by a network of dominant meanings they experience as arising from elsewhere, from those with whom they do not identify and who do not identify with them. Consequently, the dominant culture's stereotyped and inferiorized images of the group must be

73 Ibid., p. 59.
74 Ibid., pp. 58-59.
internalized by group members at least to the extent that they are forced to react to behavior of others influenced by those images.\textsuperscript{75}

The position of dominance held by the dominant groups invariably means that the infusion of dominant culture is absorbed by the oppressed groups in society with little objection or hostility because the dominant experience is the norm. Dominant cultural products are representative of the total sum of humanity. It is the dominant interpretation of events that is fact and history, and education's philosophy, aims and standards:

An encounter with other groups, however, can challenge the dominant group's claim to universality. The dominant group reinforces its position by bringing the other groups under the measure of its dominant norms. Consequently, the difference of women from men, American Indians or Africans from Europeans, Jews from Christians, homosexuals from heterosexuals, workers from professionals, becomes reconstructed largely as defiance and inferiority. Since only the dominant group's cultural expressions receive wide dissemination, their cultural expressions become the normal, or the universal, and thereby the unremarkable. Given the normality of its own cultural expressions and identity, the dominant group constructs the differences which some groups exhibit as lack and negation. These groups become marked as Other.\textsuperscript{76}

The dominant group and its culture, story and history are the norm. In so doing the dominant group is still a group but is not perceived as a group from inside itself. It is just the norm. The Young's Other groups may perceive some voices outside the norm and they see clearly that the dominant group is a group that they are not a member of. Cultural

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., pp. 59-60.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., p. 59.
imperialism is a very powerful force in our society: it is able to silence the Other, and for many, make them believe that the norm that they are presented with is their voice and history as well.

For example, when I try to restructure my line of thought and practice to reflect a more ‘feminine’ point of view, one perhaps containing an analytical style that is spherical in nature and does not have a start or a finish, I feel like I am arguing in circles and not being “rational” and critical. When I listen to fellow students dissecting a problem or topic in this manner, words like ‘unclear’, ‘unfocused’, ‘ill-informed’, ‘cut the crap’, ‘I would hate to read his/her writing’ and ‘stupid’ run through my head. Not very enlightened of me I am ashamed to say, but true. (I quickly suppress these thoughts and move to conquer the bias that invokes them, admonishing myself.) The thing that allows me to rationalize my reaction is that I was socialized in and educated by the ‘norm’ and accepted the ‘norm,’ as the way of things and history. Even when I started questioning the ‘facts’ and the histories, noting that there must have been “Other” peoples present besides dead, white, European, males, I did not question the methods of critical thinking and analytical thought. Critical thinking is just that, critical, bringing to mind the elements of impartiality and objectivity. Arguments that go in circles or that have ‘holes’ in them are ‘bad’ arguments that need revision or removal. This is the way of the educated world, of academia. And I am a good and pure example of what happens to inductees of this particular from of cultural imperialism. I realize that I am diverging into another topic and I am not
giving it the treatment it deserves as it goes to the heart of the judgment and treatment of women in higher education. Unfortunately, this is not the paper for fuller discovery. This passage is, however, an important personal example of how cultural imperialism has affected my life and perhaps oppressed my thinking:

The first aspect is the cloaking of some particular group's preferred content in one or more categories in the mantle of what is said to be "normal" or "natural." It gets portrayed, and largely accepted, as built into reality, not built for and by humans in order to interpret reality. It is assumed to be not remarkable, ordinary, available to everyone wherever they are located if they just choose to see reality correctly. The second aspect is that the social group that, in relation to another group or groups, accomplishes this cloaking, itself ceases to be seen as a group. While the boundaries of other groups, because they are different from the normal, the natural, are thereby highlighted, those of the cloaking group are camouflaged.77

The cloaking is complete and the dominant group is the norm and the way of things. (Notice that I have not changed my research, argument or writing style to reflect a new-found feminine consciousness and/or alienation.)

Jane Roland Martin's educated but 'abnormal' woman (me) is a perfect example of the oppression cultural imperialism propagates. The domination of thought, writings, the discipline of philosophy, educational content and methods, all lie within the scope of Young's cultural imperialism. Cultural imperialism is, therefore, a major form of oppression within the educational context and among social groups.

77 Applebaum and Boyd, p. 20.
The "double bind" that women are caught in by entering the educational system, and the "moral madness" that results from the oppressive nature of the schooling and negative recognition that obtaining masculine skills and traits confers on women, leads us into another "face" of oppression. Marginalization is the oppression that acts upon people to deny themselves worth and self-esteem by not valuing their work or input. The alienation of the feminine in education and the relatively exclusive promotion of the masculine as the norm creates a rich environment for marginalization to occur. Young defines the marginals as "people the system of labour cannot or will not use." Poverty and material deprivation are offshoots of marginal status and serve to perpetuate this unjust condition. Marginalization is, according to Young, the most dangerous form of oppression, depriving people of rights and freedoms that are the norm for non-marginals.

A whole category of people is expelled from useful participation in social life and thus potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination.\(^7^9\)

I am not taking the position that women in our society are on the verge of extermination or that there are not women of great privilege and wealth (both inherited and earned) to be found. I am equating Young's marginalization theory to the inequalities that do exist between men and

\(^{78}\) Young, p. 53.
\(^{79}\) Ibid., p. 53.
women, the prominence of the masculine over the feminine. There is an element of what Young refers to as exploitation in this equation but if we remember Jane Roland Martin’s male cognitive perspective that denies feminine qualities, excludes women’s work, values, and histories, and views women only through a male image, it is not hard to deduce that women are marginalized. Women’s essence, skills, words and stories are of no use in the public masculine educative world.

Women rank behind men in power, prestige and wealth. Women make and have less money; they pay more for haircuts; they are judged more severely for sexual ‘indiscretions’; they make the lunches, take time off work for their children’s doctor appointments, and experience guilt for working and putting the child in daycare; they do not hold very many positions on Boards of Directors and are rarely the CEO’s of companies. I am not footnoting the above statements because they are common knowledge. To illustrate, women not sitting on Boards was the political topic of discussion on “This Morning” on CBC Radio One with Avril Benoit (May, 1998). The phone-in lines were overwhelmed by people jockeying for position with their opinions about the hiring of women or minorities to the police, and especially the fire department! A discussion about the problem with a “woman boss” can be overheard in any coffee house with both women and men attributing ‘the problem’ to that of ‘the bitch’. The feminine orientation is not valued in business, labour and professions except when ‘child care’ is involved; but let us not forget that mothering, baby-sitting, Early Childhood
Education, social work, nursing and teaching, are berated occupations that are typically low paying. The public world does not value the feminine; its "use" is to be subordinate to the cultural norm, the masculine norm. Marginalization does occur and women are in the middle of this oppression.

The material and power deprivation experienced by many women place them in positions of dependency. Dependency is neither a valued trait nor a valued position in our society. Young points out that,

> [b]eing a dependent in our society implies being legitimately subject to the often arbitrary and invasive authority of social service providers and other public and private administrators, who enforce rules in which the marginal must comply and otherwise exercise power over the conditions of their lives.\(^{80}\)

Medical and social service professionals know what is good for those they serve, and the marginals and dependents themselves do not have the right to claim to know what is good for them.\(^{81}\)

Young makes reference to the fact that women were not given the right of citizenship in years past because they did not hold property and were not considered rational. Kathryn Morgan's arguments that women do not have full moral agency fold in with Young's theory of marginalization that I am placing at the foot of feminine alienation in the educational system. Morgan's "episodic moral epiphenomenalism," noted in Chapter Two, points out that our present Canadian Criminal Code provides for an insanity clause for women who murder their newborn infants. This implies that women experiencing pregnancy and/or childbirth are not rational; they are

\(^{80}\) Ibid., p. 54.
\(^{81}\) Ibid., p. 54.
not full moral agents. Being neither rational nor full moral agents could I believe, place women in the category of marginals—“people the system of labour [society/power] cannot or will not use.”

If the feminine, and the traits therein, were held in any esteem and given resources and power, dependency would not be such a societal ill. After all, it is ludicrous to expect people to be independent from birth to death. Young brings this point into focus:

Although dependency produces conditions of injustice in our society, dependency in itself need not be oppressive. One cannot imagine a society in which some people would not need to be dependent on others at least some of the time: children, sick people, women recovering from childbirth, old people who have become frail, depressed or otherwise emotionally needy persons, have a moral right to depend on others for subsistence and support.

The ardent liberal individualism present in the values held in esteem in our society and the oppressive nature of our individualistic stance that does not allow for full moral agency and/or citizenship outside of its realm, is being challenged by feminist theory:

An important contribution of feminist moral theory has been to question the deeply held assumption that moral agency and full citizenship require that a person be autonomous and independent. Feminists have exposed this assumption as inappropriately individualistic and derived from a specifically male experience of social relations, which values competition and solitary achievement.

---

82 Ibid., p. 53.
83 Ibid., pp. 54-55.
84 Ibid., p. 55.
Women's experience recognizes dependency as a basic human condition:

Whereas on the autonomy model a just society would as much as possible give people the opportunity to be independent, the feminist model envisions justice as according respect and participation in decisionmaking to those who are dependent as well as those who are independent. Dependency should not be a reason to be deprived of choice and respect, and much of the oppression many marginals experience should be lessened if a less individualistic model of rights prevailed.85

The feminine is marginalized, found to be little value and/or use. It is oppressed. The overwhelming masculine bias present in our educational system is proof that feminism is marginalized, of no use in the structure and content of liberal education. We come full circle back to Jane Roland Martin's problem of the alienation of the educated 'feminine'.

Conclusion

...[T]he intellectual disciplines into which a person must be initiated to become an educated person exclude women and their works, construct the female to the male image of her and deny the true feminine qualities she does possess.86

This quotation is a powerful summation of what happens to women in the liberal education system. I use it again because it illustrates so well what Jane Roland Martin identifies as the problem of the exclusion of the feminine from the educational process and the formation of women in the image of masculine, negating the feminine. I will replace Martin's words with some terms used by Iris Marion Young: the exclusion of women is the

---

85 Ibid., p. 55.
marginalization of women, and the denial of the feminine and subsequent imposition of the male experience is cultural imperialism. This exclusion and cultural imperialism are oppression of one group in society over another, and the interplay of group privilege—the "power to." This situation indicates that education is not doing its job as an essential good.

Is the conclusion that education should be scrapped all together and relegated as a burden to our society? A radical answer would be yes. But education, even with its tragic flaws, is necessary for any society, and I feel that work can be done to save education from itself, from the oppression of the male cognitive perspective. Shakespeare did not give up on Macbeth, although he displayed cowardice, greed and tyranny. And in the end Macbeth went to his death fighting with honour:

I'gin to be a-weary of the sun,
And wish the estate o' the world were now undone.
Ring the alarum-bell! Blow, wind come, wrack!
At least we'll die with harness on our back.

Macbeth, Act V Scene 6

Macbeth was a King and an honourable man before he succumbed to corruption, but the essence of his goodness remained intact.

As has been shown, education is certainly not at the ideal level where it provides good for all, at all times, regardless of social circumstances (if it is possible to disregard the social). However, education does hold the essential

good within its folds and can be redeemed. The question is, by which method can we throw off the cloak of cultural imperialism and marginalization—that is, oppression—and allow education to function in a manner that does not alienate the initiated?

It is for me to delve into the theories of "care" and caring to find some answers and viable solutions to Martin's alienated feminine. Feminist theories are challenging the present social order and rousting out the cult and 'norm' of the autonomous individual. As I proceed to other writings, I will keep in mind the social group theory of Iris Marion Young as I believe that the collective view of oppressive forces and how they function is the key to unlocking a solution using the concepts and values found in "care" and caring.
Chapter Four: The Contribution of Care

Jane Roland Martin has introduced the concept of the alienated woman. She has demonstrated that the definition of the traditionally educated person excludes women, their accomplishments and their works. The male cognitive perspective—the endemic embodiment of cultural imperialism—has constructed the educated woman into the male image of the educated person, and denied the feminine its place in education, disregarding and devaluing feminine qualities, skills and histories. I stand here on Jane Roland Martin's side, deploring, and resenting, the plight of the feminine and seeking change that would include, valued and constructed persons with both masculine and feminine values, skills and histories. I am turning to the theory of care as a body of thought and practice that offers this needed change. A change in thought and values that purports to translate into the physical, financial and practical changes that will allow the transformation of the cultural norm.

I will examine the theories and values of care in the next two chapters. They will be presented as the stepping stones to social regrouping and general acceptance of the feminine. However, the practice of caring cannot be far behind its theory, because the traditional masculine mind/body split is what is being dispelled in care theory. Care builds human interaction and feelings into the everyday teaching and flow of life. The term care has general properties about it, but takes on specific meanings in the writings of particular
thinkers. Nel Noddings is a prime example of a thinker who has developed a specific definition and defined details on the theory of care. She is the scholar I will use to illustrate and evaluate the workings of care in relation to feminine alienation and group oppression.

Before starting, I would like to note that the field of caring is much larger than the writings of Nel Noddings. I feel that it is important to acknowledge this as it puts Noddings and the theory of care in context. The question could be put forth, why use care or Noddings? Feminist theory has been working on elements of the theory of care for years. Carol Gilligan saw a problem with conventional moral theory as women were being classified as less morally competent when they chose moral solutions that included the feelings of the person and not just the higher principle involved in the moral situation put before them. Jane Roland Martin talked about the three 'Cs' of care, concern and connection. The work of Maria Montessori had an element of care, indeed much of child-centered philosophy of primary education in western educational thought points to elements of care. Unfortunately, the position of care in educational thought and practice is subject to the political climate of the day. For example, the present Ontario Curriculum is oriented towards grades, skills and subjects, leaving little room for caring interplay and philosophy. (It is also true, however, that the practice of caring can take hold

---

between persons regardless of the official written document or political mood. Individual educators do have a place and some power as front-line players in the educational system.) I will argue it is this lack of caring in the systemic sense that has held caring back from becoming the basis of educational and societal practice. The role of systemic forces will be explored in this and the next chapter.

"Caring [does] not substitute for learning; caring establish[es] an effective culture for learning." So says Joan Lipsitz in her article on caring, one of many in an edition of Phi Delta Kappan that was devoted entirely to the subject of caring. Caring is on the mind of many an academic, philosopher, teacher and parent. It is being defined and redefined in its search for acceptance and societal positioning.

But what is caring? To the academic ear, the word itself seems soft, lacking in precision, and without boundaries, and therefore not a very useful guide for investigation, let alone policy making or for directing practice. However, caring as a concept has value that stems both from its generality – the scope of its meaning – and from its accessibility. As a widely used and richly meaningful vernacular term, it forms the basis of much thought and action. People ‘understand’ caring as a necessary ingredient in the lives of all individuals, families, and communities, and it is not bound to a single religious or political ideology.

How caring is defined is of great importance because its definition will play a huge role in its ability to transform the present male cognitive perspective outlined by Jane Roland Martin.

---

The construct of caring stands in counterpoint to several philosophical themes that are dominant in our society. As part of a communal world view, caring represents an alternative to models of society and behavior that are based on notions of extreme individualism. A world view built on caring sees the individual in the context of social relationships — family, friends, religious institutions, schools, communities. Individual and collective rights and priorities are integrally connected.92

Caring does embody a change in focus and the inclusion of values and points of view that have hitherto been subordinated by the masculine cultural norm. Joan Lipsitz goes so far as to say that caring, or the lack of it, is the element in schools that determines mostly everything:

Whether we acknowledge it or not, the presence or absence of caring determines everything relational in schools: what, how, and whom we teach and discipline; why and how we group students and organize the school day; whom we hire and how we prepare them; what and how we assess; whom and how we reward; and myriad other policies.93

Our culture is passed down through socialization, education, culturalization and exposure. The narrowness and oppression inherent in liberal education, school aims and practices give us a false sense of security and knowledge. We are not receiving the whole culture. We are only receiving the parts that pass through the masculine cultural web. Caring allows us to widen the knowledge and value base and examine our cultural norms and educational practices from a far more balanced vantage point.

Nel Noddings has developed a body of work on the subject of care and caring. Her interpretation of care and the relationship of caring are widely

92 Ibid., p. 672. (Italics is mine for emphasis.)
93 Lipsitz, p. 666.
noted and known in feminist educational theory. The corner-stone of Nel Noddings' philosophy of education is the existence and active practice of caring. "To care and be cared for are fundamental human needs."94 "As human beings, we want to care and be cared for. Caring is important in itself."95 Nel Noddings asserts that the deficiencies in education can be largely rectified if the feminine philosophical school of "care" is adopted in our school and wider society. The idea behind the development of care within the educational system is to redress the imbalance presented by the traditional view of liberal education:

My argument against liberal education is not a complaint against literature, history, physical science, mathematics, or any other subject. It is an argument, first, against the ideology of control that forces all students to study a particular, narrowly prescribed curriculum devoid of content they may really care about. Second, it is an argument in favor of greater respect for a wonderful range of human capacities now largely ignored in schools. Third, it is an argument against the persistent undervaluing of skills, attitudes, and capacities traditionally associated with women.96

... [T]he first job of schools is to care for our children. We should educate all of our children not only for competence but also for caring. Our aim should be to encourage the growth of competent, caring, loving, and lovable people.97

Noddings asserts that it is natural and normal for human beings to care. The act of caring and being cared for, for Noddings, will provide a basis to work toward the abolition of oppressive forces because people will be, in

94 Noddings, The Challenge to Care in the Schools, p. xi.
96 Noddings, The Challenge to Care in the Schools, pp. xii-xiii.
97 Ibid., p. xiv
Noddings' words, "competent, caring, loving, and lovable people." The definition of "competent, caring, loving, and lovable people" includes the strong assumption that a reduction in oppressive situations will occur. Notice that I used the word 'assumption'. It is for this paper to flush out this assumption and see if it stands up to all that it embodies.

In Noddings' vision of education the traditional subject areas are reorganized to reflect greater "continuity of place, people, and curriculum." Curriculum is organized into centres of care: the self, the inner circle of friends and associates, animals, plants and the environment, the human-made world and the world of ideas. In studying the environment, Noddings would have the interests, experiences, and inquiries of the students form the content and direction of curriculum. Any and all math, science, language, history, geography, etc., implicit and/or explicit to the Centre of Environmental Care, would be taught by one teacher so as to maintain continuity, and the place and teaching of care to/with the students. Noddings is aware that this is a generalist approach but asserts that the benefits will outweigh the losses if this approach produces people who not only have knowledge but a practiced caring nature that will seek to cooperate, expel bias and include different voices.

Privileged knowledge is not necessarily the educationally "best" knowledge — something that can be, theoretically at least,

---

98 Ibid., p. 174.
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distributed to everyone. It is privileged because privileged people claim it as their own.\textsuperscript{100}

Noddings rejects the criticism that her Centres of Care are anti-intellectual.

...I want to emphasize the point that a serious study of animals is clearly not anti-intellectual. Such study draws on literature, science, history, economics, politics, art, mathematics, psychology, and religion, but it concentrates on a center of care — on something that really matters. Further, it represents another opportunity to engage in critical thinking.\textsuperscript{101}

The current emphasis on competition, universality of ideas and expertise is diminished in Noddings’ caring curriculum. There is no separation of the means from the ends, mind from body, and feminine values are introduced along with the common masculine subjects. Care is determining the content, methods of teaching, types of resources and organization of the school in general. Joan Lipsitz put it well in saying that “the presence or absence of caring determines everything relational in schools....”\textsuperscript{102}

Nel Noddings’ ethic of care has four major components: modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. Modeling is most important because it allows people to experience being cared for.\textsuperscript{103} Modeling translates into dialogue that is open-ended and encourages understanding and empathy. The two components maintain the practice of caring, and therefore, the

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., p 32.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., p. 131.
\textsuperscript{102} Lipsitz, p.666.
\textsuperscript{103} Noddings, The Challenge to Care in the Schools, p.22.
confirmation of the act of caring in society. "The moral purpose of education precedes and guides all others." The practice of caring should then transform the students, schools and the larger society. Care includes and gives value to different voices and trains people in, and to value, the art and practice of caring for and being cared-for. A moral purpose for education is achieved and the world, by rights, should be transformed for the better. By all rights oppression should be lessened if Noddings' caring formula is implemented and followed in schools and the greater society. Violence, powerlessness, marginalization, exploitation and cultural imperialism should become evils of our liberal educationalist past.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, care is not a new theory in Philosophy of Education; care has been implemented to varying degrees throughout the elementary panels in schools for a good number of years. But larger wholesale change has not taken place. People are still fighting, and accepting, the same forms of oppression, the same male cognitive perspective. Women still experience cultural imperialism by being taught the "privileged knowledge" Noddings wants to move away from in schools. So why has care

---

104 Ibid., p. xiv.

105 That is not to say that nothing has changed – change being related to socio-economic status and social class. Middle class white educated women have moved up in the social and economic meters of society, but working class and poor women have made little movement. For some women the world of the 1990's is very different from the 1950's, but too much remains unequal and oppressive. The 1993 Report on Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence - Achieving Equality put out by the Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada, has women's wages at 60.3% of men and only 1% of health care research funds spent on breast cancer - the leading cause of death in women 35 to 54. The fact that the report notes that 54% of women have experienced some form of intrusive sexual experience before the age of 16 points to women being clearly open to oppression. Change is still needed and moves slowly throughout society.
failed to transform the educational system as Noddings would have hoped? Why has it failed to become the beacon of light that revitalizes society, warding off oppressive forces? It could be argued that the theory of care is not adopted on a systemic level in schools and society. Care does not have a fair trial in society. But why doesn’t care break through the systemic barriers?

Part of the answer I believe is that Nel Noddings formed her ethic of care around the dyadic relation of the one-caring and the cared for. Noddings’ theory lacks Iris Marion Young’s treatment of oppression as a condition of groups. It is a question of addressing the systemic nature of societal oppression. Noddings assumes that by its very nature care (and its implementation) will exert pressure on systemic oppression. However, Noddings falls short of accomplishing her goal because she misses the group relationship component that Young has developed.

It is important here to define Nel Noddings’ caring relationship. “Our dictionaries tell us that ‘care’ is a state of mental suffering or of engrossment; to care is to be in a burdened mental state, one of anxiety, fear, or solitude about something or someone.”

A caring relationship is, in its most basic form, a connection or encounter between two human beings — a carer and a recipient of care, or cared-for. In order for this relation to be properly called caring, both parties must contribute to it in characteristic ways. A failure on the part of either carer or cared-for blocks completion of caring and, although there may still be a relation

106 Noddings, Caring, p. 9.
— that is, an encounter or connection in which each party feels something toward the other — it is not a caring relation.\textsuperscript{107}

The caring relationship is present between two persons, the one-caring and the one cared for. The one-caring engages in the act of engrossment toward the one being cared for and in so doing allows motivational displacement to manifest itself, creating a condition where the one-caring takes on the interests and needs of the one being cared-for. Noddings defines engrossment as “an open, non-selective receptivity to the cared-for.”\textsuperscript{108}

The one-caring, in caring, is present in her acts of caring. Even in physical absence, acts at a distance bear the signs of presence: engrossment in the other, regard, desire for the other’s well-being. Caring is largely reactive and responsive. Perhaps it is even better characterized as receptive. The one-caring is sufficiently engrossed in the other to listen to him and to take pleasure or pain in what he recounts. Whatever she does for the cared-for is embedded in the relationship that reveals itself as engrossment and in the attitude that warms and comforts the cared-for.\textsuperscript{109}

Motivational displacement is the act of taking on another person’s reality when engrossed, a “sense that our motive energy is flowing toward others and their projects.”\textsuperscript{110} Noddings further states: “I receive what the other conveys, and I want to respond in a way that furthers the other’s purpose or project.”\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{107} Noddings, \textit{The Challenge to Care in the Schools}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., p. 15.
\textsuperscript{109} Noddings, \textit{Caring}, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{110} Noddings, \textit{The Challenge to Care in the Schools}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., p. 16.
Engrossment and motivational displacement do not tell us what to do; they merely characterize our consciousness when we care. But the thinking that we do will now be as careful as it is in our own service. We are seized by the needs of another.\textsuperscript{112}

To complete the caring relation the one cared-for must respond, if only temporarily, to the one-caring for the caring relation to occur.

The caring relation is a relationship between two entities. Nowhere does Noddings state that the caring relation between the two entities is affected by the entities' membership in social groups. There is a lack of "sensitivity to the political dimensions of difference,"\textsuperscript{113} as Ford and Pepper-Smith note in their comparison of Noddings' caring and intelligibility. Systemic disadvantage, or in Young's terms "group oppression", is not a component of Noddings' caring relationship. The numerous quotations from Noddings, used above, treat the caring relationship as dyadic. (Note that the quotations were taken from works that were written a decade apart. Noddings has not evolved her definition.) Noddings' caring relationship, and the engrossment therein, are taken up by Maureen Ford and Katherine Pepper-Smith:

Again, intelligibility bears considerable likeness to Noddings' notions of care. Noddings' account of engrossment explicitly rejects external standards in favor of what she calls a 'non-selective form of attention that allows the other to establish a frame of reference and invites us to enter it' (Noddings, 1995, p. 191). Such radical attention, she says, involves 'total receptivity, reflection, invitation, assessment, revision, and further exploration.' Yet missing from Noddings' account, we suggest, is

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{113} Ford and Pepper-Smith, p. 11.
an explicit sensitivity to the political dimensions of difference that situates some people in positions of systematic disadvantage.\(^\text{114}\)

I interpret the final sentence of the quotation to mean that Noddings' caring relationship lacks the political. The political occurs in society between groups of people, or people who have memberships in groups. Iris Marion Young states that groups are "forms of social relations"\(^\text{115}\) and all individuals, their histories, viewpoints, feelings, are constituted partly by group memberships.\(^\text{116}\) Oppression in Young's terms is a condition of group interplay in society. Since groups affect all persons, so does the structural, societal nature of group oppression. Revisiting Young's words helps to clarify this concept:

> But oppression also refers to systematic constraints on groups that are not necessarily the result of the intentions of a tyrant. Oppression in this sense is structural, rather than the result of a few people's choices and policies. Its causes are embedded in unquestioned norms, habits, and symbols, in the assumptions underlying institutional rules and the collective consciousnesses of those rules....\(^\text{117}\)

Iris Marion Young points to the various groups in society that maintain domination and oppression. These groups are an intimate part of all individual identities influencing all social interaction and the relative position of individuals within societal domination and oppression. There is

\(^{114}\) Ibid., p.11. (Italics is mine for emphasis.)

\(^{115}\) Young, p.44.

\(^{116}\) Ibid., p. 45.

\(^{117}\) Ibid., p. 41. (Italics is mine for emphasis.)
always some element of group interaction in individuals' relationships.

People do not think, act or care in isolation. The oppression found within the educational system that Jane Roland Martin calls alienation, stemming from the male cognitive perspective, and the oppression in liberal education that Noddings seeks to reform through the ethic of care is I contend a condition of groups. If a lasting systemic change is to be found I feel strongly that we must look to a theory that includes within its core the idea of group relations, not individual relations. If care is to be that theory it will have to be transformed from Noddings' version of care to an amalgamation of Noddings' and Young's theories.

Noddings' theory in the ethic of care uses the individualistic, one-to-one relation of the one-caring to the one cared-for as its foundation. The following passage details her teacher/student relationship and demonstrates once again the dualism of the relation of care:

The teacher, because she is a teacher, must see things through the eyes of her student in order to teach him. She looks at and speaks about subject matter, of course, but she looks at it and speaks about it from two poles. She must interpret what she sees from one pole in the language that she hears from the other. Further, it is not only the subject matter that she must view dually. She must also grasp the effectance motivation of the student. What does he want to accomplish? Of what use may the proposed subject matter be to him in his striving for competence? What interest has he that may help her to persuade him to look at the subject matter? The teacher, I shall argue, is necessarily one-caring if she is to be a teacher and not simply a textbooklike source from which the student may or may not learn. Hence, when we look at 'pedagogical caring' we shall
begin not with pedagogy but with caring. Then we shall see what form caring takes in the teaching function.\textsuperscript{118}

Noddings feels that we “are not ‘justified’—we are obligated—to do what is required to maintain and enhance caring.”\textsuperscript{119}

Unfortunately, the maintenance of caring in schools and society will not bring about the desired changes that will transform oppression into an enlightened existence. All the reorganization of the curriculum and the teaching and practice of caring will not dissolve the oppression it is aimed at because there is a strategic flaw in the theory of caring. The ethic of care can only begin to loosen the bonds of oppression within the educational system and larger society if its argument is reworked to stand on a group notion of oppression and relation within the caring relationship.

Whether it is possible for the dyadic nature of care to be turned 180° and transformed into a three-dimensional web, encompassing group relations, the fluidity of groups, the structural nature of group oppression and the political that Ford and Pepper-Smith are looking for, is for me to explore now. For the transformation to take place, the inner working of Noddings’ theory will have to accommodate Young’s group relational theory. This accommodation comes in the form of the replacement of Noddings’ dyadic one-caring/cared-for relationship with Young’s group relation. If the social forces acting within and upon the persons engaging in the one-caring/cared-for relationship with Young’s group relation. If the social forces acting within and upon the persons engaging in the one-caring/cared-for relationship with Young’s group relation.

\textsuperscript{118} Noddings, \textit{Caring}, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 95.
for relationship are recognized as a major contagion in continuing societal oppression, then maybe we can use elements of the theory of care to counteract the effects.

Although I have argued that Nel Noddings is missing the group relation at the heart of her theory of care, she is aware of the workings of cultural imperialism in society and the educational system:

Many people today — even many feminists — espouse an equity model. They assume that the cure for women's oppression is free and equitable access to the public world. They forget, however, that the public world has been defined and built by men. The standards and practices have been established by males, and thus it is a male model that women must adopt in availing themselves of free access. It is as though men were to say: 'Here, now, we know that we have been unfair; we will now share our power and work with you; all you have to do is show that you’re up to it.' It is an unintentionally arrogant model that presupposes women want to be like men and just need the chance to grow in that direction. While I would not argue against equity, I would argue against accepting equity in a model that promotes — and even glorifies — domination and oppression. The fundamental assumption here is that to be human is to be male. An alternative is to analyze the structures and practices of our society from the perspective of women's experience and to begin the complex process of constructing a genuinely universal interpretation of culture.  

Noddings does not subscribe to the model of equality; I believe that she recognizes the systemic nature of domination and oppression. She sees the need for wholesale change in society. If Noddings had found her relational elements in the theory of care to include what I feel is here in her writing, the

[120 Nel Noddings, "Do We Really Want to Produce Good People?" Journal of Moral Education. (Vol. 16, No. 3, October, 1987), p. 183.]
systemic change that Noddings herself wants could be a much greater reality today. But the mainstay of her theory rests on the individualistic, dyadic relation between the one-caring and the one cared-for.

I would argue that Noddings does not think of it as individualistic as the tone of her writing is organic, reflecting her environmental contectiveness. She is also aware of the oppressive universality found in cultural imperialism:

The long-standing fear of being like a woman or being captured by a woman has led men... to suppose that male experience (including the male experience of women) is universal experience. This previous notion is exactly what is contested by those who espouse an ethic of caring (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984). It is perfectly clear that war is not the only universally available domain of training; a whole half of the human race is omitted in this assessment. Nor does the language of justice and rights... capture universal experience of the moral and ethical.121

I would also argue that Noddings holds the similar view of cultural imperialism as Isis Marion Young. She is coming at the subject from a slightly different approach, but her final argument includes the idea that the dominant culture has ordered the experience and history of all peoples, speaking for the entire community without thought of difference or oppression. The ideas, actions and records are 'natural' and 'normal' in their masculine form. Noddings puts forward the example of Emily Greene Blach to highlight the exclusion of women and their concerns. This passage also shows Noddings' understanding of the systemic nature of cultural

121 Ibid., p.182.
imperialism. She clearly does not see a major breakthrough for women and recognizes the oppression inherent within cultural imperialism.

Women have done things of great importance that go unrecognized because they were done by women and because the focus of their efforts has not been the focus of political history. Consider the case of Emily Greene Blach. Although she received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946, her name does not even appear in a major encyclopedia published in the 50's. In contrast, Generals Pershing and Patton each have entries of a column or so in length and a picture. Was Blach left out because she was a woman or because peace is unimportant compared with war? In the late seventies edition, the same encyclopedia includes Blach in an entry of a few lines. Pershing and Patton still appear prominently – with pictures. My conclusion is that she is now included because she was a woman and important publications today must include women. I do not believe that she is included because historians and curriculum makers have awakened to the importance of peace studies or because they now recognize the significance of work that women have found central in their lives.122

Given that Noddings has an understanding of the systemic nature of oppressive forces and the role it has played in excluding women's histories and the mainstream consciousness of society (or at least the brokerage of power in society), can I not say that Noddings' theories are large enough to include Young's theories of group oppression? While I could merge the theories of the two thinkers, this would be a simplification of the theoretical bases of Noddings and the significant change in outlook that Young has advanced in her writings. At the heart of her stance on oppressive forces and her acknowledgment of systemic interplay, Noddings still subscribes to an individualistic view of the relationship of caring. And given the fact that the

dyadic relation is fundamentally juxtaposed to the group relation and can act as a contagion for oppression, it is no stretch to conclude that substitution of one theory for the other is no simple matter, if it's even an option. Noddings' theory of care would have to be rebuilt if the foundation of the dyadic relation is negated. I am sure that elements of care would be used. They would look and feel similar but under the surface the interactions and interplay between theory, people and their actions would be fundamentally different. There would be a collective caring, a collective responsibility, a collective response. Even when broken down into two people acting in a caring manner, their group membership and influences still play a their part in the interaction. This fact is very different from Noddings' individual one-caring and the one being cared-for. Why is it so important? Because Noddings believes that caring will make loving human beings who will change the world, correct inequities, eliminate oppression, and harmonize society. The core of her caring is the relation between two people, not groups or people comprised of group influences and relations. Although I am confident that Noddings is not unaware of group relations and the larger societal forces on people, she does not make them the crux of her argument:

In the human domain, the relational sense of caring is paramount (Nodding 1984). A relation is caring if both parties – carer and cared for – contribute appropriately. In equal relations, those characteristics of mature adults, parties freely exchange positions as carers and cared-fors... but even in unequal relations, the recipient of care contribut[ions are] essential. He or she responds in a way that recognizes the carer's efforts at caring
and, by doing so, injects energy – new spirit or vitality – into the relation.\textsuperscript{123}

"In the human domain, the relational sense of caring is paramount."

Noddings is up front about this in all her writings on caring. And the relationship is always between the one-caring and the one cared-for. The relationship is dyadic in construction and nature.

As an ethical orientation, caring has often been characterized as feminine because it seems to arise more naturally out of woman's experience than man's. When this ethical orientation is reflected on and technically elaborated, we find that it is a form of what may be called \textit{relational ethics}. A relational ethic remains tightly tied to experience because all its deliberations focus on human beings involved in the situation under consideration and their relationships to each other. A relation is here construed as any pairing or connection of individuals characterized by some affective awareness in each.\textsuperscript{124}

The first member of the relational dyad (the carer or 'one caring') responds to the needs, wants, and intimations of the second. Her mode of response is characterized by \textit{engrossment} (non selective attention or total presence to the other for the duration of the caring interval) and \textit{displacement of motivation} (her motive energy flows in the direction of the other's needs and projects). She feels with the other and acts in his behalf. The second member (the one cared for) contributes to the relation by recognizing and responding to the caring.\textsuperscript{125}

With Noddings entrenched in the dyadic relation, we are at an impasse if we are to use her theories to produce the fundamental change in thought and practice needed to allow the feminine to receive due energy, time, resources and value in our school system and the larger society.

\textsuperscript{124} Nel Noddings. "An Ethic the Caring and Its Implications for Instructional Arrangements." \textit{American Journal of Education.} (February, 1988), p. 218..
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., p.219.
Conclusion

I am arguing here that it is morally irresponsible to simply ignore existential questions and themes of care; we must attend to them. But it is equally irresponsible to approach these deep concerns without caution and careful preparation.\textsuperscript{126}

It is important to take Noddings' words to heart and critical examination. That is what I have done in chapter four. The inner workings of Noddings' theory of care were dissected, revealing the foundation of her writings and beliefs. Noddings' theories were put in a greater context to show the place and importance of the theory of care in the larger community of educational philosophy and teaching. Beyond the academic importance and position of caring, let us not forget that the implementation of the theory would directly influence people's especially children's lives. Robert Chaskin and Diana Rauner bring home the impact that care has on children and the role of the school system in imparting caring skills, feelings and outlook. They also remind us that caring can and does fall prey to the many conflicting agendas found in the educational system and society. As mentioned earlier, the present Ontario Curriculum is a good example of a curriculum that does not have caring at its ideologically centre (or for that matter on its periphery).

It seems that the most important influences in the prosocial development of children are the experiences that form the foundation of caring – receiving nurturance and empathy and being given opportunities for mastery. For children deprived of such opportunities in the family, relationships outside the family that allow young people to experience personal efficacy within supportive systems can powerfully affect the development of caring.\(^{127}\)

As the most important extrafamilial environment for most young people, schools have recently been identified as primary arenas for the promotion of caring. However, a combination of curricular objectives (e.g., skills development and specialization) and external stresses (e.g., budgetary pressures and isolation from family and community) often overpower the best intentions of educators.\(^{128}\)

Care as a theory has credibility and the potential to have a marked influence on the educational system and society in general. Unfortunately it has not succeeded nor is it about to succeed, in changing the systemic oppression found within our society and promulgated by our educational system. I have established that Noddings’ reliance on the dyadic relation as a founding element of her theory of care does not aid in developing care as the solution to the problem of feminine alienation. The male cognitive perspective (described by Jane Roland Martin) is still at work in our society and education system. It is the norm, and well protected in its guise as the culture norm. The oppressing forces of culture imperialism and the group dynamic therein have a strong hold on society. Care in its present form is not capable of overcoming or modifying these forces in its present form. Care

\(^{127}\) Chaskin and Mendley Rauner, p. 673.  
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must incorporate group relations at its core to have a chance at making the kind of transformation that Noddings and other proponents of care are seeking. The incorporation of the group relations and their roles in maintaining oppression will transform the theory of care. Care will take a different form that cannot be placed under the same category as its substantive nature will have changed.

Nel Noddings and her theory of care falls short of providing an answer to the alienation of the feminine, so I move on and back to the thinker who presented us with the problem, Jane Roland Martin. Examination of her later writings, notably her book *The Schoolhome*, will allow the development of a theory that Martin has a sensibility closer to that of Isis Marion Young at the centre of her educational reform. For Martin, caring is a major component and is based on a collective viewpoint that is very conscious of societal forces and group interplay.
Chapter Five: A Solution to Feminine Alienation?

In this chapter I will take a detailed look at Jane Roland Martin’s book *The Schoolhome*. It is my contention that a path to the solution of feminine alienation can be found in Martin’s later writings. Whether or not a full solution is found will present itself for analysis by the end of this chapter. In seeking the answers to feminine alienation in Martin’s work I return to the words and writings of Virginia Woolf. Martin takes her lead from the writings of Woolf in *The Schoolhome* and I began this thesis with Woolf’s words.

Virginia Woolf notes the passing of the 1919 Act that allowed women to enter the professions for the first time in England, in her 1938 essay *Three Guineas*. Woolf feels the Act gave women permission to remove themselves from the domestic sphere and enter the world of public work.

But in imagination perhaps we can see the educated man’s daughter, as she issues from the shadow of the private house, stands on the bridge which lies between the old world and the new....

The bridge between the old and the new, or the domestic-private-women’s sphere and that of the public world of production and men, is important symbolically. The bridge represents the division between the private and the public spheres, a division that can be bridged if the resources and attitudes for doing so are present. We are still building and rebuilding this same bridge

---

today, fighting to maintain its necessary communicative link, while working
to change the structure of the bridge and the spheres on either side of the
chasm over which it spans. The professions act was passed in 1919 and yet as
late as 1929 in her essay *A Room of One's Own* Woolf recounted her inability
in enter a college library without the accompaniment of a male student or
staff member.

Martin notes that in the 1960's and 1970's she was so indoctrinated into
the cultural norms that she did not realize that the domestic was devalued in
education:

> When R. S. Peters mapped the educational terrain in the 1960s
> and 1970s, I did not notice that home's educational role is
> systematically slighted. No one then did. In fact, it was only after
> I began to see that domesticity is repressed in educational
> thought that I realized how differently we as a culture assess the
> contributions of home and school.130

We are still standing on Woolf's bridge imagining a world that gives true
entrance into both the old and the new—with the added difficulty that we
now recognize the cultural imperialism that has denied women a true
passage and acceptance on the other side.

Jane Roland Martin acknowledges that the process of becoming
educated today is still one of walking over the bridge and leaving the
domestic behind.

> Nevertheless, as a culture we think of becoming educated not
> just as a process of acquiring new ways of thinking, feeling, and
> acting. We also assume that it is a matter of casting off the

---

attitudes and values, the patterns of thought and action associated with domesticity.\textsuperscript{131}

We basically agree with Woolf that life on the other side of the bridge is competitive and that the people there have to be pugnacious and possessive in order to succeed. But then it follows that if education is to do its culturally assigned job properly, the insertion into school of any traces of the love, the nurturance, or the three Cs of care, concern, and connection associated with home and domesticity will be regarded as counterproductive. It follows that to expose children to ‘soft pedagogics’ will be seen as a failure to prepare them for the world.\textsuperscript{132}

Martin sets out to reclaim the domestic, the home, in \textit{The Schoolhome}. She sees the need for the skills, attitudes and values of the home in institutional education, as well as the need for the educational institution to collaborate with the home to ensure a well-rounded education. This means that the make-up of, and the transformations in, the home are of great importance as they will dictate the type and content of school curriculum. The state of modern domesticity in America is analysed by Martin in her attempt to formulate her schoolhome. All of Martin’s connections and relationships in developing her schoolhome are of a group nature and involve looking at families, governments, institutions and systems. She is aware of the cultural imperialism that has entrapped people, particularly women, and seeks a solution through care on a systemic basis. Martin’s version of care may have a greater chance of providing a solution to the problem of feminine alienation than that of Nel Noddings because of Martin’s treatment of group

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., p. 138.
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relations in the formation of her form of the theory of care. This is what I shall flesh out in this chapter.

Before I put Jane Roland Martin’s theory together with that of Isis Marion Young, it is important to grasp the essence and some of the details of Martin’s idea of the schoolhome. Martin turns to an educator at the turn of the last century for help in creating her schoolhome. Maria Montessori and her Casa dei Bambini provide inspiration and direction for Martin. Montessori put schools in tenement housing in 1912 Italy, schools that fed and educated underprivileged children. Children who were once thought to be incapable of learning or able to learn very little began to flourish. Montessori operated her schools on a child-centered approach, allowing children to learn at their own levels in a directed manner. Martin notes that Casa dei Bambini is translated to mean children’s house or house of childhood, but Martin wants to take Montessori’s words and ideas and translate them into the children’s home.

Montessori envisioned the Casa dei Bambini as a “second womb” where children would feel “safe, secure, loved, at ease.” The “homelikeness was to be educative” and provide children with the right environment to stave off the development of ‘deviated’ adulthoods. The reason Montessori’s Casa dei Bambini was so nurturing and needed to be a “second

---
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"womb" was because of the state of the homes that the tenement children resided in. Poverty, malnutrition, over-crowding and disease played a devastating role in 'dumbing down' these children. The breakdown in the home meant that valuable knowledge and morals were being devalued or lost. To Montessori the home had an important role to play in the education of children and if the home was not performing this role it was the job of the school to perform the home's educative functions.

Martin points out that the home stills plays the same educative role in our society and still is not given due recognition for its work. "Because home is the hidden partner in the education of our young, we tend to forget how much who we are, how we act, and what we know was learned there when we were very young."

Martin notes that we change and hide behind language to disguise the contribution of the home:

Like the housewife's labors that are not considered real work, home's contributions to a child's development are not called 'education'. In keeping with an argument that has made home the silent partner of school, we use a special vocabulary to describe what happens there. The teaching mothers do at home is called 'child rearing' or 'bringing up,' the resultant learning 'socialization,' 'acculturation,' or even 'development.' Denying through our choice of words both the seriousness of the teaching and the societal significance of the learning, we underestimate the educative powers of the domestic context and the importance of the curriculum of the home for the lives of children and the continuation of society.

In order for our society to function, taking in the needs of good health, individual and group relations and interaction, and general rules of conduct

\[\text{Ibid., p. 18.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., pp. 27-28.}\]
and order, we need common-sense actions to occur. People need to know how to interact with individuals in a given setting. They need to know how to look after themselves and their communities on a daily basis. As a behavioural special education teacher I can state from experience that the most difficult knowledge, skills and attitude to instil in children are the social and affective modes. It is much easier to teach them to read or conceptualize math. If the basic human social norms are missing or damaged, the children do not function inside or outside of the classroom. The knowledge and skill traditionally taught in the home or by the domestic world are of the utmost importance to the lifelong functioning of individuals and their communities. As Martin points out, life skills are not yet outmoded activities:

Washing yourself, brushing your teeth, taking care of your belongings, cleaning house, serving meals, tending to the needs of younger children are not yet outmoded activities. Neither are the various forms of the three Cs of care, concern, and connection exhibited in the Casa dei Bambini, such as being civil to adults and hospitable to guests, entering into the joys and sorrows of your intimates, feeling a sense of oneness with them, and responding directly to their needs.\textsuperscript{139}

When the educative role of the home has such intrinsic value to the functioning of people and our society, it only makes sense that we take the time to see that the functions of the home are being preserved and transmitted. Martin is doggedly aware how the family, the home and the

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 33-34.
roles of women have changed in the later half of our century. Women are crossing Woolf's bridge by the millions, leaving the home empty. The divorce rates are soaring and with them are the number of single parents and weekend parents. Homosexual couples and individuals are choosing to have children, and as are many single women. The variance in family structure and lifestyle has happened upon our society both by choice and by default. The result is a transformation of the home, a transformation where domestic knowledge and skills may not be being transmitted to the younger generation, potentially leaving children with gaps or complete blanks in their life knowledge. Because domestic knowledge is intrinsic to life functioning and even happiness, it behooves us to make sure that it is imparted. If the home cannot play its traditional role, society can entertain the needs of the children. As an institution, schools are positioned to fill in the domestic gaps left by societal change. Martin is keenly attuned to the crisis in domestic education.

With home and family having undergone radical transformation, it is downright foolhardy to overlook home's part in educational enterprise. Now that both fathers and mothers are leaving home to go to work we have to ask anew what radical change in schools suffices?140

Our challenge is to turn the schoolhouse into the Schoolhome: a moral equivalent of home for our young that will be responsive to the needs and conditions of children and their parents at the end of the twentieth century as the Casa dei Bambini was at an earlier time.141

140 Ibid., p. 8.
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Martin is adamant that the changes and condition of the modern family be taken into account when viewing what the role of the school is and should become.

I am as thoroughly convinced as anyone that the country’s vocational education system needs overhauling. But this nation’s political and educational leaders talk repeatedly about setting higher standards in the teaching of literacy, math, and science and about the school’s failure to develop a highly skilled workforce – without ever seeming to notice that our changed social reality makes correspondingly radical changes in schools imperative. To put it starkly, there is now a great domestic vacuum in the lives of children from all walks of life.  

Martin is thinking in terms of groups: children, women, families and socio-economic groups. Family groupings do not neatly fit into Iris Marion Young’s definition of group relations and membership; however, Martin is looking toward the family as a group. She is viewing the family as an evolving group that needs consideration and help from educational systems and schools. Note the title of her book is *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families.*

In viewing the family as a group, Martin is not negating the membership in groups of individuals within the family. The individuals in Martin’s families do fit into Young’s social groups (poor, female, no education, black, juvenile, age, etc.) and experience the oppression imposed upon the group or groups that they hold membership in. Martin is keenly aware of the “great domestic vacuum in the lives of children from all walks

---

of life” as I have quoted above. The vacuum is a result of the state of the family and the pressures, oppression and transformation of the individuals that make up the family. Although I think Martin does view the family as a group that engages in social relations, I realize that there is a problem placing human characteristics on a socially contrived entity. It could be strongly argued that only the individuals in the family have the capacity to engage in relations and/or be oppressed. Martin does not develop her argument on this point enough to carry the point further, however, because Martin also sees the individuals as involved in group relations, Young’s group argument is very relevant.

The type of domestic curriculum that Martin wants to see in the schoolhome will benefit all these groups. The curriculum will facilitate and enhance the communication and social understanding between these and many another groups. The trend in North America to treat students as workers and schools as production sites disturbs Martin and is a tangible sign of the continued suppression of the domestic:

Thinking of school as a special kind of production site — a factory that turns out workers for the nation’s public and private sectors — government officials, business leaders, educational administrators focus on standards. ... For America’s public schools it translates into efforts to improve testing, to hold teachers accountable for student failures to measure up, and to standardize curriculum.¹⁴⁴

The new vision of education the Schoolhome represents does not picture young children as raw material, teachers as workers

¹³ Ibid., p. 356.
¹⁴ Martin, The Schoolhome, p. 41.
who process their students before sending them onto the next station on the assembly line, or curriculum as the machinery that over the span of twelve or so years forges America's young into marketable products. It does not conceive of school as a marketplace and children as workers, entrepreneurs, and consumers either.145

Martin's vision of the schoolhome and the needs of different groups in society would take a back seat in the Province of Ontario at the moment. The current Ontario Curriculum and offices like the EQAO (Education Quality and Accountability Office) adhere closely to the marketplace model that Martin is disturbed by. Standardized testing, marketable skills and accountability are at the forefront of the government's agenda. Art and music programs taught by specialists at the elementary levels are being phased out in many schools in the Board that employs me and there is even less room to implement a domestic curriculum. That is not to say that care, concern and connection are not part of the collective agenda of teachers, but it is not at the forefront of the written Ministry documentation or budgeting considerations.

The focus of the present educational program is to march both male and female children across Woolf's bridge, leaving the home and the domestic behind. It is the continuation of the masculinization of our culture and people. One can hear the ringing of Isis Marion Young's warning of cultural imperialism, as the experiences of one segment of society become the norm and the goal of the whole society. Martin cites the case of the societal grouping of white middle-class males to illustrate her point:

145 Ibid., p. 41.
I would say that we are much better off knowing and acknowledging the limitations of those earlier achievements if only because theories that falsely generalize – for instance, from data on the psychological development of White middle-class males to human development in general – can dangerously mislead; and narratives that trade in stereotypes – of, for instance, American Indians – can cruelly deceive.146

There is very little dissent heard when our children walk into the world of public matters because this world is what continues to be valued by the society at large.

Our society expects school to equip children for life on the other side of the bridge. Or, to put it another way, the function our culture assigns school is that of preparing the nation’s young to carry out the economic and political tasks and activities located in the public world. Given this clear objective and the fact that children begin their lives in the private world of the home, school sees its mission as that of transforming inhabitants of the one world into denizens of the other.147

In her writing Martin feels and addresses the cultural imperialism that excludes and limits groups of people. She does not use the exact same language as Young does, but the essence is the same—some segments of society are heard, have influence, have value and construct norms while other segments of society are silenced, devalued and are engulfed by the dominant group. Nel Noddings, as explored in the last chapter, also understood cultural imperialism. However, the fact that Martin never limits or defines her theory to a dyadic relationship (as Noddings does) allows Young’s group oppression theory a position within Martin’s writings as the foundation of Martin’s theory does not have to be dismantled to use,
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incorporate or merge with Young. And as argued earlier, Martin views people in terms of groups and their membership in groups. Children are a group for Martin that fit into Young’s group relations. Children are affected, as a group, adversely by the present trends in education. Women, as a group, experience oppression in Martin’s societal analysis. If Martin did not see the systematic oppression of women as a group in education and the wider society, I would not be writing this thesis based on Martin’s alienation of the feminine.

There is a substantial fear of the feminization of boys and men. Society must overcome this fear if we are to break the oppressive hold the masculine cognitive perspective has over our society and educational institutions. Remember the story of the 6-year-old Sikh boy who was being teased by his classmates at the beginning of this thesis? The issue for the mother of the child was that he was being called a girl and this was the greatest of insults. There is a definite bias against and a phobia towards the feminine in our society and subsequently in our schools. I have always found the lack of tolerance for the feminine dangerous. Much of what allows people to maintain civilization is contained in what are traditionally recognized as feminine traits: nutrition, sanitary practices, inter-personal communication and skills, empathy, beauty, childbirth, child rearing and protection for the young and old, the maintenance of the family and the sexual companion of the large majority of men are all aspects of the feminine. Where would we be as a society or a civilization without the elements of femininity above—
isolated, lonely, ill, at war, dying, dead, extinct? Martin addresses and counters this misplaced phobia:

Does our culture's domophobia—its devaluation of and morbid anxiety about things domestic—make it hard to imagine that boys and young men will be willing to learn the values, virtues, responsibilities, and processes of domestic living? ... I have high hopes that by raising the consciousness of the hidden curriculum, in anti-domesticity of both school and society and making it a topic of study in the curriculum proper while adopting a gender-sensitive approach, the Schoolhome will be able to work through, instead of repeating, the myriad resistances to home and family.148

Martin goes so far as to call immoral the denial of feminine in boys lives and the exclusion of the feminine from the public realm. I think she is right, as this denial contributes to violence, alienation, rigid thinking, and other traits that mark the breakdown of civilization. The exclusion of the feminine in education and the public world alienates women (and men) from themselves; this is immoral.

Should the Schoolhome be encouraging this sort of "gender crossing"? Does it not place boys at risk? The case is quite the opposite. Since the near side of the bridge has always been and still is inhabited by both sexes, it is unreasonable, if not actually irrational, to deny boys and men knowledge of it. Given that the ability to take the point of view of another is a basic element of morality itself, it is unconscionable — I would say positively immoral — to deprive them of the opportunity of identifying with the other half of humanity. Besides, how can girls feel at home in a culture whose curriculum excludes their perspective? How can boys respect girls if they are never encouraged to see the world as girls do? How in these circumstances can girls respect themselves?149

149 Ibid., p. 76.
Jane Roland Martin, like Nel Noddings, promotes an interdisciplinary approach to schooling to help redress the balance between the masculine and the feminine. Martin does not develop or detail her approach to the extent that Noddings does, but she does give examples of topics that would go a long way in introducing other histories and values. Martin points out that Plato refused to let stories about Hera be present in the teachings for the guardians. Hera was the goddess of hearth and home, of domesticity. Feminine attributes had no place in the world of the guardians, the leaders and power brokers of the Platonic society. In Martin’s schoolhome Hera would be a topic for study, harnessing all disciplines to give students a different point of view, allow them to investigate alternative patterns of behaviours and histories. "The inhabitants of a schoolhome will learn science and literature, history and math. But they will also learn to make domesticity their business."150

The exploration of positive variant histories in the schoolhome curriculum will give weight and validity to diverse voices and points of view. Students and the wider society will begin to take these diverse points of view seriously.

In a land in which rape is rampant, the victims of child sexual abuse are most often girls, and women are subjected to sexual harassment at home, at school, and at work, is it sensible to say that courses that represent and analyze women’s history, lives, and experiences are parochial and take too subjective a point of view?151

---
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Knowledge of the feminine realm should help alleviate some of the systemic stereotyping and oppressive biases against groups of people that are not in the operating societal power elite. To allow the systemic changes necessary to tackle the alienation of the feminine and create a new reality for women and men, Martin feels that there should be a new domestic curriculum that works through racial, ethnic, religious, and gender antagonisms, and has a solid foundation in the three C's (caring, concern, and connection)\textsuperscript{152} and carries variant points of view and histories:

Tying the inhabitants together with invisible threads spun by shared emotions that derive from common experiences, they can thus weave young people of different races, classes, ethnicities, religions, physical disabilities, sexual orientations, into their own web of connection.\textsuperscript{153}

The change that Martin, Noddings, and Young are looking for and working towards is not going to happen overnight even if we hit on the 'right' formula for solving the problem of feminine alienation. To transform a society and its power bases is a monumental task, more so when the oppression is pervasive and at the same time hidden. It is no secret in Ontario today that the government making the decisions affecting the educational system does not hold that half (or all) their students population is not being serviced adequately. Martin maintains that our society is in denial when it comes to the condition of the family and education:

\textsuperscript{152} Martin, \textit{The Schoolhome}, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., p. 98.
It is downright irrational to persist in assigning school a function that is defined in relation to and relies on home’s educational agency while denying the existence of that very agency. It is also the height of folly to assign what we take to be our one and only educational agent the single task of preparing children for life in the public sphere, although even as adults they will continue to dwell in private homes. Besides, given the great changes home has undergone in recent decades and the importance to both the cultural wealth that home has been charged with transmitting, to equate education with schooling, yet continue to endorse a function for school that is premised on home’s carrying out an opposite but equally important function, is short-sighted in the extreme.154

The tendency of the political right to give lip service to ‘the family,’ and the good it does, does not acknowledge the vacuum in many homes caused by socio-economic needs and the redefined family unit. There is simply no one at home to instill “family values”. Empty phrases also fail to give the home the importance it deserves. But I believe that home has intrinsic value and educational purpose and so does Martin. The schoolhome is her method of recognizing the worth of the home, and an acknowledgment that traditional homes may no longer be playing the full role required of them:

Believing that the private home is potentially, if not always in actuality, a moral institution—a force for good in children’s lives—I propose that benign versions of it be preserved and a new institution be created to lighten its load. Collaborating with the variegated forms of the new private home, the Schoolhome will take on some of the functions the latter can no longer carry out on its own, but only some.155

That is why the redefining of the aims and function of the school is so

154 Martin, “There’s too Much to Teach: Cultural Wealth in an Age of Scarcity.” p. 9.
important. When there was someone at home the domestic curriculum was taught before the children crossed the bridge to the public world. Now the children are crossing the bridge without having a foundation in the domestic realm. This must be corrected, and the school may have to be an agent for the reintroduction of the domestic on several levels.

Retaining the institutions of private home and family but rejecting as anachronistic a sex-based division of labor and embracing instead the goal of sexual equality, my reclamation of the domestic tranquillity clause makes domestic tasks and responsibilities in the private home everyone’s business. Assigning to both sexes the job of infusing the public world with a domestic spirit and atmosphere, it treats the asymmetry that now exists as a challenge to American culture and an opportunity for the Schoolhome—not as an invalidation of the project.\footnote{Ibid., p. 183.}

As stated earlier in this chapter, at no time in her writing about the schoolhome and the domestic curriculum does Jane Roland Martin perceive as dyadic the relationships that oppress women or allow for the creation of a new reality. The threes C’s of care, concern and connection are not contingent on the relation between the one-caring and the one cared-for as is the case in Nel Noddings’ theory of care. The transformation that Martin is seeking is rooted in the relations that people have in society and the societal interactions that play on people. I am using the word “people” as Martin does not define the oppression and exclusion experienced by women in terms of group oppression as Isis Marion Young does. However, I am arguing that
Martin is measuring her ideas on oppression, exclusion and alienation in terms of group oppressive forces. When Martin refers to women she is referring to them as a group. Women are excluded as a group. They are devalued as a group. When she sees the women crossing the bridge she sees them as a unit comprised of individuals acting as and being acted upon as a group.

To judge from the look of those women on the bridge I am not so sure that they are managing well. Some of them are barely dragging themselves along. Instead of stepping onto solid ground as they walk off the bridge, they are disappearing from view.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 152.}

Care, concern and connection can happen at an individual level (in the manner of Noddings’ caring), but they are not based on individual interaction but on a group scale. Martin illustrates her social perspective in her description of the education of young males away from the male cognitive perspective:

Acting as friends and co-workers of women, rather than as protectors and patronizers, the males who come to their rescue will have to be brave enough to defy society’s stereotypes. As boys over there in the Schoolhome are now learning, genuine male courage today means doing with grace, not resentment, what our culture has traditionally, but nevertheless arbitrarily, labeled women’s work, and sharing responsibilities that have long been assigned to the opposite sex.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 154-155.}

The males brave enough to defy society’s stereotypes are a group. They are acting as a group and being re-educated as a group. Their acceptance as a group of the value of the feminine will change the way the male group
interacts with the female group. The oppressive forces of group domination will lessen or disappear, cultural imperialism will take a back seat to an era of interaction where the power relations are on an equal footing.

This, of course, is all in theory, but I believe this theory has a greater chance of making headway into the present establishment of feminine oppression and devaluation. Martin states that “all education is moral education”\(^{159}\) so education must be redefined in order to effect and redress the balance between the masculine and the feminine to reflect moral fairness. We have to feel it moral to include all voices in our culture. We must make the moral choice to value the feminine and the domestic world. It is not an individual choice or change that will remove feminine alienation in education because if it was it would have happened already as many individuals have publicly taken up this cause—Noddings and Martin included.

It is the understanding that a path to the answers of feminine alienation and the exclusion of many voices in society is to be found in the analysis and study of the interaction, interplay and connections of people to groups, groups to groups and the nature to the domination and oppression that results from the connections. It is in the relational aspect of people and groups that domination, oppression and power find their birth and life force. Martin turns to John Stuart Mill in concluding her need for societal

\(^{159}\)Ibid., p. 168.
mobilization and interplay to aid in a solution to the group oppression of women:

In conclusion, let me return briefly to Mill. Mill wanted education and opinion to ensure that a direct impulse to promote the general good was a habitual motive of action of each individual. My partial solution to the problem posed by cultural superabundance requires that the actions of the whole range of cultural custodian/educational agents be similarly inspired.¹⁶⁰

Conclusion

The problem of feminine alienation in education and society has been discussed, with its inherent oppression and devaluation. Educational historian Ruth Roach Pierson refers to this oppression and devaluation as lack of "independent personhood."¹⁶¹ If we look back in history to the few feminist writers whose messages have survived time and the male cognitive perspective, we find that "independent personhood," and the freedom, accountability, respect, power and privilege that comes with "independent personhood," are a common theme. Mary Astell, writing in the seventeenth century, wanted to establish a college for women to correct what she described as the "mistakes of our Education"¹⁶² which were responsible for the position of women in relation to men:

¹⁶⁰ Martin, "There's too Much to Teach: Cultural Wealth in an Age of Scarcity." p. 10.
The Incapacity, if there be any, is acquired not natural, and none of their Follies are so necessary, but that they might avoid them if they pleas'd themselves. Some disadvantages indeed they labour under, ... but Women need not take up with mean things, since (if they are not wanting to themselves) they are capable of the best. Neither God nor Nature have excluded them from being Ornaments to their Families and useful in their Generation: there is therefore no reason they should not content to be Cyphers in the World, useless at the best, and in a little time a burden and nuisance to all about them. And 'tis very great pity that they who are so apt to overrate themselves in smaller Matters, shou'd, where it most concerns them to know and stand upon their Value, be so insensible of their own worth. The Cause therefore of the defects we labour under is, if not wholly, yet at least in the first place, to be ascribed to the mistakes of our Education, which like at Error in the first Concoction, spreads its ill Influence through all our Lives.  

The eighteenth-century writer Mary Wollstonecraft "sought for women... 

self-determination. 'This is the very point I am at,' she wrote, 'I do not wish [women] to have power over men; but over themselves.'"  

While no command of a husband can prevent a woman from suffering for certain crimes, she must be allowed to consult her own conscience, and regulate her conduct, in some degree, by her own sense of right. The respect I owe to myself, demanded my strict adherence to my determination of never viewing Mr. Venables in the light of a husband, nor could it forbid me from encouraging another.  

Virginia Woolf points to the economic considerations of "independent personhood" in her essay A Room of One's Own, published in 1929.  

All I could do was to offer you an opinion upon one minor point — a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction.... Perhaps if I lay bare the ideas, the

---

163 Ibid., p. 6.  
164 Pierson, p. 209.  
prejudices, that lie behind this statement you will find that they have some bearing upon women and some upon fiction.\textsuperscript{166}

In her explanation of independent personhood Pierson, like Ford and Pepper Smith, hones in on the necessity of the politicization of the feminine experience:

Integral to this feminist pursuit of independent personhood is the critical awareness of a sex/gender system that relegates power and authority to men and dependence and subordination to women. Feminists start from an insistence on the importance of women and women’s experience, but a woman-centred perspective alone does not constitute feminism. Before a woman-centred perspective becomes a feminist perspective, it has to have been politicized by the experience of women in pursuit of self-determination coming into conflict with a sex/gender system of male dominance.\textsuperscript{167}

Astell, Wollstonecraft, Woolf and Pierson provide a look at the development of feminist thought leading us to Jane Roland Martin. Martin, with her quest to establish the domestic curriculum in schools, is working toward Pierson’s elusive independent personhood. The inclusion of women, their work, values and histories, the making of women in the image of women and the recognition of the feminine domain should redress the balance and allow women to be partners in society’s cognitive perspective. To rid ourselves of feminine alienation in education, redistribute the relational balance between dominant and subordinate forces and become partners in the cognitive perspective are lofty and necessary outcomes of any solution formulated to address the status quo. Martin’s \textit{Schoolhome} contains the

\textsuperscript{166} Woolf, pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{167} Pierson, p. 203.
fundamentals that go a long way to establishing a new order in education and societal attitudes.

Martin’s educational theory as put forth in her writings recognizes the great need for care, concern and connection. This part of Martin’s schoolhome is right in line with much of Nel Noddings’ ideas. Noddings, who is striving for the same partnership for women as Martin, puts great emphasis on caring and the relations necessary for the creation of a caring relationship. The narrowness of Noddings’ dyadic relation halts the progress of caring in the education system and society as it does not take the group nature of human interaction on all fronts. Martin’s three C’s are loosely combined with relations that involve group interactions and are not confined to the individual level. Because Martin’s ideas allow for the group nature of relations, the theories of Isis Marion Young, which define and detail the workings of group oppression in relation to dominance and subordination, can bond with parts of Martin’s work. I believe that this pivoting point of view from individual relations to that of group relations is the key to allowing the theory of care to take hold at the systemic level.

Whether we use the words of Kathryn Morgan and call the oppression of women “moral madness” or ascribe oppression “to the mistakes of our Education” as Mary Astell voiced it, there is no doubt that oppression and inequality exists in our education system and society. Martin and Noddings have positioned themselves to transform the attitudes, cognitive mind sets, and educational institutions, and to redress the power relations. Martin, with
the help of Young, is making headway at least in the theoretical sense. The proof of change will be in the transformation of children's perspectives. These new perspectives must become norms in society and passed down unconsciously in both the domestic and public realms. Martin talks in terms of her own discipline as an example of domesticating the public realm.

If the philosophy of education tackles questions about childrearing and the transmission of values, if it develops accounts of gender education to inform its theories of liberal education, if it explores the forms of thinking, feeling and acting associated with childrearing, marriage and the family, if the concepts of coeducation, mothering and nurturance become fair game for philosophical analysis, philosophy of education will be invigorated.168

The people in Martin's schoolhome have unhindered passage across Woolf's bridge and have the ability and the right to take parts of each to the opposite side. The people (and situation) are politicized as they have experienced the oppressive nature of group domination and cultural imperialism. They know what it is like not to be heard, and are able to recognize when the "Others" are in a position of subordination. Only time will tell if Martin's schoolhome takes hold in the wider educational context: the road to transforming the educational system at its foundation is monumental and full of peril. Given the present trend in commodity education, the schoolhome and all the ideas it embodies are not being given a lot of attention, and it appears that Martin's and Noddings' recommended changes are a long way off. But the schoolhome does have the means to evoke

change. Let us hope that the ideas of domestic value and inclusionary vision have some effect on the status quo, remembering that change that sticks is incremental. Have we found a solution to feminine alienation as Martin defined it? I hope so. I do think we now have a good start. "[D]ifferent we are, as facts have proved, both in sex and in education." ¹⁶⁹

But what I find deplorable, I continued, looking about the bookshelves again, is that nothing is known about women before the eighteenth century. I have no model in my mind to turn about this way and that. Here am I asking why women did not write poetry in the Elizabethan age, and I am not sure how they were educated; whether they were taught to write; whether they had sitting-rooms to themselves; how many women had children before they were twenty-one; what, in short, they did from eight in the morning till eight at night. ¹⁷⁰

Perhaps Virginia Woolf's words will ring less true in time.

¹⁶⁹ Woolf, Three Guineas, p. 229.
¹⁷⁰ Woolf, A Room of One's One, p. 42.
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